DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 534 EA 003 610

AUTHOR	McIntyre, Kenneth E., Ed.
TITLE	The Principalship in the 1970's. Bureau of Laboratory Schools Monograph No. 23.
INSTITUTION	Texas Univ., Austin.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	108p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The University of Texas Press, 120 West 20th Street, Austin, Texas 78712 ($4.00)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Qualifications, *Administrator Role, Collective Negotiation, Decision Making Skills, *Educational Administration, *Educational Change, Instructional Technology, *Principals, Role Playing, Symposia, Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS	Administrator Education, Career Development, Project PLAN

ABSTRACT

This document contains a collection of papers presented at the University Council for Educational Administration Career Development Seminar. The papers included are: L. D. Haskew, "The Individual School in the 1975 Educational System"; Edwin M. Bridges, "Personal Success as a Determinant of Principals' Managerial Style"; Conrad Briner, "Viewing the School Principalship"; Luvern L. Cunningham, "Educational Reform and the Principal" and "Alternatives to the Principalship"; Michael P. Thomas, Jr., "Students and the Shaping of the Principalship"; Cecil Mansfield, "A Report on a Principal's Experience in Project PLAN"; and Kenneth E. McIntyre, "What Kind of Person (if any) Is Needed?" (JF)

RECENT PUBLICATIONS OF
BUREAU OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

11. MEETING INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES IN ARITHMETIC, by The Casis School Faculty, Directed and Edited by Frances Flournoy and Henry J. Otto (1959). Price $2.00
12. SELECTION AND ON-THE-JOB TRAINING OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS, by Kenneth E. McIntyre (1960). Price $2.00
13. THE CURRICULUM INTEGRATION CONCEPT APPLIED IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, by James M. Ward, John E. Suttle, and Henry J. Otto (1960). Price $2.00
14. BUILDING ENTHUSIASM FOR LEARNING IN CASIS-DILL ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, Directed and Edited by David C. Sanders (1961). Price $2.00
15. TELEVISION AND CONSULTANT SERVICES AS METHODS OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHERS OF MATHEMATICS, by M. Vere DeVault, W. Robert Houston, Claude C. Boyd (1962). Price $2.00
16. AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES, PART I—COMPONENTS OF THE PROGRAM, by Clyde Inez Martin (1963). Price $2.00
17. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SOCIAL STUDIES, PART II—THE CHILDREN'S PROGRAM, Directed and Edited by Clyde Inez Martin (1964). Price $2.00
18. THE EDUCATION OF THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD IN CASIS SCHOOL, by The Casis School Faculty, Directed and Edited by M. G. Bowden and Henry J. Otto (1964). Price $2.00
19. VALUE ORIENTATIONS IN FOUR ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, by Thomas H. Foster, William K. Katz, and Henry J. Otto (1966). Price $2.00
20. ADOPTION AND UTILIZATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION, by Wailand Bessent, Ben M. Harris, and Michael P. Thomas, Jr. (1968). Price $2.00
21. NONGRADEDNESS: AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL EVALUATION, by Henry J. Otto and Associates (1969). Price $3.00
22. AN EVALUATION OF AN EXPERIENCED TEACHER FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, by Henry J. Otto and Edgar Wailand Bessent (1970). Price $3.00
23. THE PRINCIPALSHIP IN THE 1970's, Edited by Kenneth E. McIntyre (1971). Price $4.00

Address orders to:
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS PRESS
120 WEST 20TH STREET
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78712

ED052534

BUREAU OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS MONOGRAPH NO. 23

The Principalship in the 1970's

Edited by

KENNETH E. MCINTYRE

The University of Texas at Austin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Published by

THE BUREAU OF LABORATORY SCHOOLS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN

with the assistance of

THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

1971

EA 003 610

CONTENTS

Introduction v

CHAPTER 1

A Brief Overview of the Seminar, James E. Russell, Jr. 1

CHAPTER 2

The Individual School in the 1975 Educational System,
L. D. Haskew 7

CHAPTER 3

Personal Success as a Determinant of Principals' Managerial Style,
Edwin M. Bridges 13

CHAPTER 4

Viewing the School Principalship, Conrad Briner 25

CHAPTER 5

Educational Reform and the Principal,
Luvern L. Cunningham 36

CHAPTER 6

Alternatives to the Principalship, Luvern L. Cunningham . . . 57

CHAPTER 7

Students and the Shaping of the Principalship,
Michael P. Thomas, Jr. 61

CHAPTER 8

A Report on a Principal's Experience in
Project PLAN, Cecil Mansfield 66

CHAPTER 9

What Kind of Person (if any) Is Needed?,
Kenneth E. McIntyre 75

CHAPTER 10

Panel-Symposium: Underlying Assumptions About the Future and the Preparation of School Principals at Three UCEA Universities. Presentations by Ray Cross, John Maas, and Fred Staub; Alan Gaynor, Moderator 93

THE PRINCIPALSHIP IN THE 1970's

INTRODUCTION

I suppose that the editor of any symposium passes briefly through a period in which he has visions of producing a publication that has unity, coherence, and a momentum that builds up to a crashing climax in the last chapter. In planning for the UCEA Career Development Seminar that occasioned this collection of papers, we attempted to build a tight design that would produce more than a disparate aggregation of monologues, and I hope that we succeeded to some extent, largely through the informal discussions that were interspersed among the more formal presentations. Without these informal linkages, however, I fear that the papers which follow will lack some of the cohesiveness that we so earnestly sought. Instead, our individual efforts are likely to resemble Clark Kerr's multiversity, which he described as "a benevolent anarchy, consisting of a loose confederation of departments held together mainly by one plumbing system." Lacking even a plumbing system to hold our contributions together in this volume, we invoke the reader's imagination to supply the ties that might bind our separate endeavors into one unified whole.

Unfortunately, the essence of some of the most stimulating activities of the Career Development Seminar could not be captured and reduced to print. Included in this category are the following: the session in which Luvern Cunningham led us through a role playing of a discussion by a group of citizens seeking an alternative to the school principalship; the laboratory exercise conducted by Martha Williams, to demonstrate the superiority of consensus over other means of reaching decisions, and even more important, to demonstrate one of the more impactful methods that can be used in training principals; the interview in which Paul Rothaus, a psychiatrist, and Ira Iscoe, a psychologist, questioned three junior and senior high school students and then had the students role play the way they would administer a school; the panel discussion in which Professors Ben Harris and Carl Ashbaugh, together with Warren Seyfert of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, talked about changes in the role of the teacher and the implications of those changes for the principalship; the comments on collective negotiations and the principalship, by William F. Young, a veteran of negotiations sessions as a school administrator in Dearborn, Michigan; and the observations concerning instructional technology and the principalship, especially as exemplified in Project

PLAN, by Robert Marker, a former professor of educational administration who is now Vice-President ofthe Westinghouse Learning Corporation. Not the least popular of the seminar's activities was the happy hour that Bill Barron presided over every afternoon in the UT suite, providing welcome lubrication for spent mental gears. Each of these activities added substantially to the seminar for those present, but none could be described vividly enough for a written publication to do it justice.

We present only the more formal papers here, hoping that they will stand on their own as contributions to the growing body of literature on the emerging school principalship. The authors will welcome your comments.

University of Texas at Austin
KENNETH E. MCINTYRE
July 1, 1970

CHAPTER I

A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE SEMINAR

JAMES E. RUSSELL, JR.

[Editor's Note: For the benefit of those who like to sniff and nibble at a table full of intellectual viands before making crucial selection decisions, we asked one of our doctoral students, James E. Russell, Jr., to attend all of the sessions and to capture their essence for us. Mr. Russell's summary first appeared in the June, 1970, *UCEA Newsletter*. It is presented here in the hope that it will help the reader to get a quick "feel" for the seminar as a whole and to select papers for detailed study. Since some of the sessions consisted of laboratory exercises, role playing, interviews, and discussions, there were no formal papers for those activities; hence, Mr. Russell's report should serve to fill the resultant gaps to a limited extent.]

The school principalship was the subject of intense scrutiny during the Twentieth UCEA Career Development Seminar held on May 3–7 in Austin, Texas. Hosted by The University of Texas and directed by Kenneth E. McIntyre, the seminar utilized an array of resource people from several areas of the educational enterprise to focus upon factors relevant to the principalship in the 1970's. Ten UCEA member universities, along with several national, state, local, and private educational organizations, were represented among the fifty participants at the seminar, which was entitled "Whither the School Principalship and Preparation Therefor?"

In addition to the presentation and discussion of papers, conferees were involved in role-playing and a laboratory training exercise, plus an interview with several junior and senior high school students. Topics ran the gamut, from consideration of societal forces affecting the principalship to the very nature of the man needed. Some of the highlights of each of the sessions are reported in this article. Presentations are identified by title, with presenters recognized in the text of each summary.

L. D. Haskew, University of Texas, sees the role of the individual school as the primary definer of what a principalship will be. In assessing such roles, he concludes that while some role assignments are well entrenched, in the majority of school systems the individual school has ample opportunity to develop roles for itself. The school's role in determining instruction was considered most significant, with schools existing at all points along a continuum, from "delivery stations" which simply pass on instruction received from a central source, to microcosmic schools that define and design their entire programs. Although microcosmic schools are expected

to become more prevalent because of urban influences, Haskew predicts that the role of the individual school in 1975 will be essentially the same as it is today.

Edwin M. Bridges, University of Chicago, examined the importance of success in the world of work from economic, social, and personal viewpoints. He noted that, although the individual has a strong need to be able to measure his success on the job, such measurements are in reality quite difficult—especially in educational organizations. Administrator training programs, because of restricted conceptions of success and the fuzziness of research in this area, tend to aggravate the problem of measuring success. However, Bridges' major tenet is that the managerial style of a given principal is determined to a great extent by how he chooses to solve this success problem. Four dimensions along which a solution may be understood are outlined: (1) the yardsticks a principal uses to measure his success, (2) his capacity to work effectively without knowledge of the results, (3) his beliefs about cause-result relationships, and (4) the way he responds to success and failure.

A humanistic view of the principalship and of organizational nature was chosen by Conrad Briner, Claremont Graduate School. His fundamental premise is that man, given freedom to do so, will move naturally toward growth and self-fullfillment. Today the traditional roles of the principal, district administration, and the state are "up for grabs" if present societal turmoil is any indication. As an alternative, a method of school organization based in part upon the "free system" espoused by Neill in *Summerhill* is proposed, including the elimination of compulsory education and all forms of coercion in the schools. The primary role of the principal would be to understand the nature of freedom and set the tone for this in his school; such a principal would be highly flexible, gearing his efforts to the needs of school members.

"In the 1960's we were oriented toward change; during the 1970's the language needs to be that of reform," stated Luvern Cunningham, Ohio State University, as he discussed the failure of schools to come to grips with the problems generated by today's turbulent times. Such large-scale reforms are thought to be inevitable in view of the immense problems currently facing our schools and the inadequacy of the piecemeal changes of past years. In contrast to our present educational bureaucracy, Cunningham foresees the creation of a whole new set of institutions such as residential schools and family development centers, although these are not advocated as solutions to today's problems. Discussions which could greatly affect education are currently taking place in five major policy arenas: (1) elimination of compulsory education as we now know it, (2) adoption of

a voucher system, (3) redefinition of educational control systems to bring them closer to local community members, (4) elimination of tenure and revision of credentialing practices, and (5) community experience as a means of de-institutionalizing education. Principals are advised to "hold the line as best they can, anticipate the apocalypse, and participate in the formulation of large-scale reforms when they come."

Three goals were set forth for the role-playing session directed by Luvern Cunningham: (1) to test a different mechanism for generating insights, (2) to critique the vehicle itself, and (3) to produce alternatives to the principalship. Seminar participants were recruited to play the roles of a committee of parents, students, teachers, noncertified personnel, and administrators given the task of considering alternatives to the principalship of their school. Teams of observers were assigned to critique the product, process, and social science aspects of the exercise. Although the role-players failed to produce alternatives to the principalship in the time allowed, meaningful analyses of group interaction and insights into the role-playing process were viable outcomes of the session.

An interview with three junior and senior high school students who exhibited not the least bit of hesitation in 'telling it like it is" added a unique dimension to this session. Dr. Paul Rothaus, Southwest Center for Psychiatric Services, assisted by Ira Iscoe, Professor of Psychology at The University of Texas, directed the interview which produced some candid commentary concerning students' views of the principalship. Although not seen as completely bad, principals were chastised as being too far removed from and unresponsive to students' needs, autocratic, biased against some student groups, and basically lacking the ability to communicate with students. Following the interview, the three students played the role of a principal, with seminar members providing hypothetical problems for them to solve. In summarizing the session, Rothaus outlined a method of looking at management strategies based upon a grid with axes identified as (1) leader power and (2) power allowed to others by the leader. Four basic strategies were recognized, and their implications for the principalship were stressed.

Increased teacher militancy is a major factor forcing the evolution of new principalship roles, according to William F. Young, Deputy Superintendent of Schools in Dearborn, Michigan. In tracing the emerging pattern of negotiations in public schools, Young indicated that principals need to develop new competencies in the areas of consultation and implementation of negotiations agreements. Although the principal is generally excluded from the bargaining table, he is viewed as still having ample latitude to provide educational leadership. Looking into the future, Young predicts a merger of the NEA and AFT, as well as the formation of administrator

bargaining groups. The labor-management negotiations model was seen as highly unsatisfactory for public schools, and a call was issued for educators to develop new models based upon the premise that both sides in educational negotiations have common goals.

Warren Seyfert, National Association of Secondary School Principals, and Carl Ashbaugh, University of Texas, explored this topic in conjunction with panel moderator Ben M. Harris, University of Texas. More personalized and humanistic teaching, further erosion of tort immunity and *in loco parentis,* and more general acceptance of the accountability principle were seen by Ashbaugh as natural products of the societal forces acting upon education today. A recurrence of the community involvement of the 1950's is expected, but in terms of decision groups rather than advisory groups. Seyfert expressed the view that principals need to learn more about administering staffs of assistants, and urged the inclusion of information from disciplines such as sociology and management in administrator training programs. He feels that the principal's primary role is still that of an instructional leader and should continue to be so. Harris asked whether the teacher's role was really changing, noting studies indicating that teachers are still primarily controlling in nature and oriented toward stability and security.

In a highly effective utilization of the laboratory method, seminar members explored the many ramifications of group descision making under the direction of Martha Williams, Professor of Social Work at The University of Texas. Conferees were first given a problem to solve as individuals, then were formed into small groups and instructed to solve the same problem utilizing the method of consensus. Feedback was given later, illustrating the superiority of consensus in arriving at quality decisions. A hierarchy of decision methods and their relationship to decision adequacy was outlined. From poorest to best, these methods were: (1) individual, (2) average individual, (3) minority control, (4) majority control, and (5) consensus. The commitment value inherent in consensus was stressed, while factors such as time and group size were listed as limitations on the effectiveness of the method.

"The role of technology is to try to find tools to do better what we know how to do in education," stated Robert Marker, Vice-President of the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, as he introduced a program of individualized instruction called "PLAN" to seminar participants. PLAN was described as basically consisting of modules of learning containing groups of objectives and suggested methods for achieving them. Teachers serve primarily as resource persons on call as their students work independently and in small groups to achieve module objectives. Adequate

resource centers are essential to the program, as is the use of a computer to schedule and test students. Students are ungraded and generally work at their own rates. Advantages include development of affective as well as cognitive areas, increased self-reliance, and high motivation of students.

One school where Project PLAN is currently being implemented is Reed Elementary School in San Jose, California. Cecil Mansfield, Reed principal, discussed its effects and impact, stressing the resultant changes in the roles and functions of teachers and principal. Revision of teacher selection and evaluation procedures, reorientation of parents, faculty, and staff, and changes in reporting practices were necessitated by PLAN. Discipline problems were significantly lowered, and students generally felt highly positive toward the new approach. Greater heterogeneity of groups was made possible, with group flexibility for scheduling purposes a key aspect of the program. The importance of having flexible physical facilities was stressed by Mansfield as a definite asset in initiating a program such as PLAN.

Kenneth E. McIntyre, University of Texas, sees little likelihood of major changes in schools or the principalship during the 1970's. However, he does identify several forces at work which are affecting the principal's role: (1) the changing nature of students, (2) the increased power and militancy of teachers, (3) the impact of technology, and (4) urbanization with its resultant socioeconomic polarization. The principal is seen as becoming "an expert on how to change the environment for accomplishing the school's goals" rather than being oriented solely toward either management or instruction functions. After making a convincing argument for the inclusion of more women in administration, McIntyre discusses four characteristics felt to be essential in the person needed for the principalship in the 1970's: (1) a reasonable amount of intelligence, (2) effective interpersonal abilities, (3) a moral nature sensitive to human needs and to the broad issues of right and wrong, and (4) a strong physical and emotional makeup, including an ability to adapt to change. He concludes that such people are rare, and educators need to improve their selection and recruitment tools in order to compete effectively for their services.

Concluding the Career Development Seminar, Alan Gaynor, UCEA Associate Director, served as chairman of a panel composed of Ray Cross, University of Minnesota, John Maas, University of Wisconsin, and Fred Staub, Ohio State University. After Gaynor gave a brief resume of the significant questions raised during the seminar, panelists Cross, Maas, and Staub reported on their universities' expectations for school organization and the role of the principal in the 1970's, as well as on their institutional

plans for principalship preparation. Following this, two salient points emerged as seminar members discussed the panelists' reports: (1) preparation programs need to include more emphasis upon the instructional program, and (2) training institutions need to work more closely with principals and other administrators.

CHAPTER II

THE INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL IN THE 1975 EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

L. D. HASKEW*

One minor irritant endemic in educational planning is that we never know precisely what we are talking about. This seminar, for example, addresses "the school principalship" as an entity to be planned for. But, what *is* a school principalship? A position in an organization, to be sure. A position whose "-shipness" may be posited as a resultant of varying nomothetic and idiographic forces operative at a given time and place. However, such postulates only characterize; they fail to identify principalship. To handle an entity by planning we require discriminative locus and function. Those are hard to come by.

In locus, nearly all principalships in this country reside in organizations conducting elementary-secondary education. But near-universality stops there. The chief executive office of state eleemosynary institutions is frequently titled principal, as is the headship of residential independent prep schools. In urban school districts, positions titled supervising principal span as many as 15 or 20 school units. In numerous smaller districts, the title of principal connotes an assistant in the superintendent's office. Organizational location of the principalship is prolix to the point of bafflement.

Prolixity becomes overwhelming when one seeks discriminativeness in terms of functions ascribed. Anyone plowing through the thirty years of census reports on duties and responsibilities of school principals gets documentation enough. Add those Books of Revelation called "job descriptions" in school board regulations, and then pile on top the professorial punditry appearing in textbooks, yearbooks and seminal addresses. Webster is incapable of producing an adjective sufficient to comprehend even the profusion of, much less the degree of internecine conflict inevitable, between egregiously utopian ascriptions.

In short, the principalship as an existential phenomenon is too amorphous for planners to handle. Part of that phenomenon must be isolated. This paper chooses one delimiting device. It takes the modal locus and the

* Mr. Haskew is Professor of Educational Administration at the University of Texas at Austin.

modal functions performed by people-in-positions titled principalships. In that modal territory, the principalship is located in a single school that is one among several production stations in a local school district. Its function is to serve as top management for that production station. The position is typically occupied by just one person, but is frequently pluralistic.

The chief—but certainly not the only—production responsibility assigned this unit is to output desired behaviors by pupils. Pupil loads range between 300 and 3,000; employee complements between 15 and 175. The behaviors desired by the system are primarily cognition and conformity. The modal principalship, to repeat for emphasis, is thus identified as top management for a single school serving as a production station in an organization.

But "top management" remains undefined. To plan education for occupants of principalships, the planners need to know what top management comprehends. We never shall, this author opines. But we can know in part. Fairly well established is the co-relation between what people-in-positions do, on the one hand, and what authoritative forces—in combination—tell the occupants to do. That is, authoritative forces prod toward accountability, and accountability prods toward performance. By understanding from whence come these authoritative forces, and what they are like when they arrive, planners get a leg up on defining top management in existential terms.

Now we get to the crux of this paper. Authoritative forces playing upon the principalship are numerous, characteristically kaleidoscopic. Among them, however, one stands out currently as dominant. The inertial behavior of social systems being what it is, this dominance bids fair to stand out long after 1975. That authoritative force is what the local school system, by direction or permission or capitulation, delivers as role to the individual school as production unit. The expected role of the unit, we posit, is the primary definer of what top management consists in. That is another way of saying that as is the school, so shall be the essence of principalship. Not absolutely or exclusively, of course. But valid for predictions that can assist planmaking. The remainder of this paper is based upon that assumption.

What roles will be assigned to the individual school in 1975? The obvious answer is, "about the same as those assigned in 1970." Drastic changes do occur in education, but few within a span of five years. Hence, preparation of this paper began with re-immersion in the role-assignments to individual schools. Used were folk tales, descriptive literature, pronouncements and guidelines, survey reports, textbooks, interpretations by prestigious observers, and a great deal of conversation with on-the-scene performers.

Perceptible role-changes-in-progress were present; revolution-in-the-making was not discovered, except through the eyes of some who identified themselves as revolutionaries. Three conclusions emerge from this *ersatz* investigation.

First, some role-assignments seem to be well entrenched for most individual schools. Schools—and *not* the school system—are to be the prime movers in defining and molding "proper" pupil deportment in schools. Individual schools interface between schooling and the parents of pupils. Also theirs is prime responsibility for keeping children and youth in school, and for pushing them through school—whatever "school" may be. They are to coopt employees into becoming organization men, acting to counter idiographic bents with nomothetic influences. And, the individual school's role is to operate most of the logistics of organizational maintenance. These roles exhibit persistent inertial momentum. One can expect them to penetrate as authoritative forces long beyond 1975.

Second, I conclude that in the majority of school systems the individual school has considerable leeway to develop roles for itself. It can become a social welfare agency for a neighborhood, enter the public entertainment field, adopt methodologies and spawn traditions unique to itself. Assigned a servile (usually called loyal) role with respect to system policy, a given school can become an exception to that policy. Straightjacketed as an automaton by suprasystem bureaucracy, a school can outwit the bureaucracy and to some extent at least, do its own thing. Apparently, obstacles to self-determination of school role have been increasing for two decades, but departures from system norms have not diminished in proportion, so far as I can tell. Schools continue to seize autonomy. In 1975 that should still be characteristic.

The third conclusion is perhaps most significant for this seminar. It deals with what was tabbed earlier as the chief production operation of the individual school—outputting pupils exhibiting and retaining desired behaviors. For shorthand, let us label this operation as instruction.

Examining recent instruction operations in school systems was not primarily for the purpose of finding what instruction is like and where it is headed. That did prove pertinent. But we were searching for relative placements of the school system and of the individual school in the dynamics which are defining and redefining the content, method, and objectives of instruction. That is, *who* is prime determinant of what instruction is expected to consist of and amount to?

The scene discovered is analogous to the pictures produced from weather satellites. You name the developing relationship you want to find and we can point to it somewhere in the picture. Hence, what does one do? He

searches the picture for what seem to be major weather systems on the make. For our purposes these are typological role-assignments to individual schools with respect to the what and how of instruction. In weather-system fashion they will compete with each other for dominance of the continent. But in education fashion, the picture will evolve in slow-motion—over decades, not in months. I perceived three such systems, somewhat antithetical. They compose my third conclusion, now to be presented.

Let us call one system RO. The letters stand for retail outlet. Instruction is centrally (*i.e.* at LEA, REA, SEA, or National locations) fabricated, incorporating goals, behaviors to be produced, differentiations in content for pre-categorized users, criterion expectations, and pacing. It is packaged with prescribed methodology and technological implementation, including that for training salesmen. The salesman (deliverer) in some instances is through when he turns on a television monitor and dials in the pupils' intercom relations with the computer. But thirty minutes later he may be applying an intricate mental system for diagnosis, prescription, and motivation of flesh-and-blood youngsters. The distinguishing feature of this system is not its use of science-fiction trappings—although those are somewhat essential—but the deposit of command of instruction in central intelligences and not in the choices of classroom teachers employed in an individual school. The individual school is a retail outlet for, not the creator of, instruction. And, it is a manufacturer's branch, not an independent merchant selecting its inventory from multiple purveyors of offerings.

The second system is tabbed CPU, standing for corporate production unit. Held loosely accountable for production of vaguely-specified pupil behaviors, the individual school is constrained by the corporation—the parent school system. Constraints are exercised by modeling, materialing, monitoring, and mesmerizing. The models are goal statements, content distributions, pupil-performance accounting, mandates on some production methodologies and techonologies, and so on. Materialing consists of corporation formularies of what each school will have as material means to pursue instruction's ends. Monitoring is usually labeled consultative supervision and/or pupil performance reporting and/or standards compliance. Mesmerism is the chief constraint, conducted by advocacies such as in-service education enterprises, curriculum guide fabrication, or themes for the year—"come on now everybody, let's individualize" or "what have *you* done about drug abuse today?" Restraining features of corporation constraints have been increasing recently in potency and scope, hastened by the rising stars of conglomerates as part-owners, so to speak, of school district corporations. But, anti-restraint features of corporation constraints persist also. Models may genuinely represent the school as a creative, free-

wheeling production unit and market-server. Corporation-stated goals are so vague they may serve as justifications for almost any school-chosen varieties of behavioral objectives. Content specifications are more nebulous than definitive; pronouncements on scope of behaviors are spottedly prescriptive, but rarely proscriptive. Monitoring may measure against criterions, but seldom does the corporation invoke sanctions to punish deviations. Even prescribed, or strongly-advocated, production methodologies are almost universally dependent upon successful seduction of professionals who teach, and all know what happens there. Because it has been on-the-make for two decades already, the CPU system shows up prominently on our picture, but I suspect it is no longer a breeder system, producing more energy than it consumes.

The third system I label DDS. D stands for designer. The second D stands for definer—in the Existential as well as the Idealistic sense. The S stands for schooling. Composing this system are individual schools—located in corporations—which are becoming microcosms of the total educational endeavor. They *are* instruction, all of it, from goaling to encapsulating behaviors they designate as "being educated" for this pupil at this time and place.

Let me try to make doubly explicit the distinctive feature of these schools. It is that governance of schooling is tacitly delivered *in toto* to the school, with one exception. Resource availability is constrained by the corporation; but, down the years the limits on gross dollars available may become the only corporation constraint. The remaining power of governance, so far as instruction goes, is complete. "These pupils are like this," the school decrees with no appeal from that decree. From there on the school governs what shapes up as educative design and as strategy to implement that design, finding its way with confident freedom to experiment, evaluate, and judge itself by the results it gets. For content and methodology it may cohabit with the recorded experience of the race with education, or it may remain virginal. It may select and procure outside assistance, or choose to remain uninvaded. It may slavishly imitate or fiercely pursue uniqueness. What it chooses to do, however, is not the key feature of the DDS role-system for individual schools. The key lies in the role-perception held by the school itself, and shared tacitly by the corporations and the conglomerates, that what the school does in the name of instruction is its own business—an awesome responsibility.

Now for a didactic recapitulation. The authoritative forces directed by school systems at individual schools in 1975 will be much the same as those broadcast in 1970. The school, hence its top management, will be expected to call the shots on student deportment and student power. It is to pacify,

and preferably please, parents. It is to keep youngsters in school until the rites of passage are completed. It is to produce employee identification with the system's culture. It is to be the prime overseer of organizational logistics.

But then we enter an unsettled domain of authoritative force. The role-expectations for the individual school with respect to instruction are up for grabs. A system of force labeled CPU, an old one, is still the major one but may be running down. Another system labeled RO is gathering steam, ingesting energy from educational conglomerates. A third system labeled DDS, sharply antithetical to RO and semi-subversive to CPU, seems to be forming. It is in this unsettled domain that plan-makers for principalship preparation will pay their money and pick the winner. Give me 1990, not 1975, and I will take RO—not because I prefer it but because I like to win.

With that, the projector for 1975 is turned off. Seminar participants and other students of principalship preparation will have to draw such implications as there are, if any, for educating principals-to-be. But one exhortation may be permissible for a projectionist.

Projections are extensions of resultants of natural and social forces evident at a given time. Projecting assists planning, but it is *not* planning. Planning is, at its best, an exercise in telesis. That is, an attempt to give intelligent direction to those forces—and hence their resultants—toward a desired end. Training programs are always to some extent a reflex to projection. They can be also an exercise in telesis. Training programs can look at the approaching individual school and produce shapees from that vision. Or, they can look at the same approacher, and attempt to produce shapers of a different vision. The only trouble is, one has to be smart to do the latter.

CHAPTER III

PERSONAL SUCCESS AS A DETERMINANT OF PRINCIPALS' MANAGERIAL STYLE

EDWIN M. BRIDGES*

Introduction

Let me begin on a negative note. The burden of my song is not how we might identify those individuals who are likely to succeed as school principals or how we might single out those individuals who are currently performing successfully in this key middle management role. Like you, I too eagerly await the discovery of a divining rod that vibrates whenever it strikes success or the potential for success. Perhaps unlike you, however, I am less than optimistic about the profession's capacity to solve the success problem. In fact in my most pessimistic troubled moments I fear that the problem is not soluble and that, despite our best efforts,[1] reliable predictors and indicators of successful performance in the principalship will continue to elude us.

Given my admittedly gloomy picture of success, why then have I chosen to focus my remarks on an issue which I assert resists solution? The reason is simple, if not quixotic. I believe that the notion of success has utility for extending our understanding of why individuals who occupy the position of school principal vary so widely in their organizational behavior. Consistent with this belief, I hope to show in the time available the role personal success plays in determining a principal's basic managerial style. Most of what I have to say is by way of speculation; it is undoubtedly a mixture of fancy and reason. Separating the fanciful from the reasonable needs to be done. This task I leave to the skeptical and the curious.

The Importance of Personal Success in the World of Work

Nearly forty years ago Kurt Lewin stressed the importance of success

* Mr. Bridges is Associate Professor of Education, University of Chicago.

[1] Two of the best efforts to date are John K. Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen, *Administrative Performance and Personality* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962) and William C. Schutz, *Procedures for Identifying Persons with Potential for Public School Administrative Positions* (Berkeley, California: University of California, Cooperative Research Project No. 1076, 1966).

and failure to every individual's growth, development, and outlook.[2] Interestingly enough, his analysis of success and failure, even though it appeared in a journal entitled *Occupations*, did not connect these two phenomena with the world of work. He waxed eloquent about some of the antecedents and consequences of individual success and failure but never explored these factors in relation to organizational or occupational performance. In light of the more recent theoretical and empirical developments that focus on the meaning work has for man's existence, Lewin's oversight appears to have been an egregious one.

Work is significant in the life of a man because it dominates half of his waking hours and has more potent economic, social, and psychological meanings for him than anything he does, either on a regular or an intermittent basis.[3] In economic terms, a man's work is a medium of survival and a major determinant of his life style outside the organization. Besides assuring the necessary level of subsistence for himself and his family, a man's earnings influence where he lives, the quality of education his children receive, the kinds of clothes he wears, the type of car he drives, and the nature of his opportunities for after-hour pleasure and leisure. Unquestionably a man's encounters with success in his chosen line of work either limit or expand those aspects of his life which depend upon his economic standing.

Undeniably a man's work has significant social meanings for him. Occupational success can enhance his position as head of the household while failure can undermine it. If a man succeeds in his work, he is a source of pride to members of his family and their respect and liking for him are reinforced by the sentiments of friends. On the other hand, if the man is only moderately successful or even mediocre in his work, his status in his family is diminished accordingly. The fact that a man's position in his family and his standing in the world of work are inextricably interwoven clearly argues for success being a major motive of behavior.

A man's work also bears important psychological meanings for him. Since the founding of this country more than 200 years ago, work has been a major source of self-respect.[4] Both education and religion glorify work. Work gives a man reason for being; it justifies his existence. The man who does not work is a "nobody." If he does work, how much of a "somebody"

[2] Kurt Lewin, "The Psychology of Success and Failure," *Occupations,* XIV (1936), 926–30.

[3] Harry Levinson, *The Exceptional Executive* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969), pp. 19–27.

[4] Robert J. Havighurst, "The Values of Youth" in Arthur M. Kroll (ed.), *Issues in American Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 3–21.

he is rests in no small measure on how successful he is. Self-respect, self-esteem, and self-worth cannot be easily divorced from success in the world of work.[5] Until our society deflates the value of work, failures in one's occupation will be painful experiences while successes will be self-enhancing.

Finally, a man's work is psychologically meaningful to him because of the countless opportunities work offers him to satisfy his need for mastery. Recently psychologists have come to recognize that man is motivated by the continuing need to grow in competence and to demonstrate mastery of the environment.[6] As a consequence, man is novelty-seeking; he is eager to experiment and to try the new and the different. Man is titillated by activities which involve exploring, investigating, and manipulating an unknown environment. Such activities are frequently found in a man's work. Success in them engenders a sense of personal efficacy while failure contributes to a decline in perceived self-adequacy. A man's encounters with occupationally-related success, therefore, will affect his general sense of well-being and mental health.

The Problematic Character of Gauging Personal Success in Educational Organizations

If my previous assumptions about the personal significance of man's success in the world of work are valid, then the urge to be successful should be conspicuous among school principals. In consequence, they should be searching for knowledge of results, some evidence that their performance is or is not successful. The principal's internal radarscope should be in a constant state of readiness, poised to detect those blips on the organization screen which foreshadow or point to personal success and failure.

The principal's desire for knowledge of results is not easily satisfied, however. In fact, I contend that there are conditions which impede his quest for reliable information about how well he is doing. These conditions are prevalent in educational organizations and are aggravated by certain characteristic features of training programs in educational administration. Let me turn now to those organizational conditions and programmatic features.

Few school systems in this country evaluate the performance of principals on a regular, continuing basis. The teacher, not the building principal, is the target of evaluation efforts. Typically the organizational machinery

[5] Eli Ginzberg, *The Unemployed* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1943).

[6] Robert W. White, "Motivation Reconsidered: The Concept of Competence," *Psychological Review*, 66, 5 (1959), 297–333.

for teacher assessment creaks along with most of the levers and gears being pulled by the principal. Systematic efforts to inform principals of their own progress and the quality of their own contributions are rare. Even when principals are the objects rather than the agents of evaluation, the information is more likely to be reported to the Board of Education than to the principal. Therefore, relatively few principals routinely receive organizationally prescribed feedback which they might use to make realistic judgments about the extent of their success or failure.

Another factor contributes to the psychological darkness in which most principals enact their organizational roles. Executives are inclined to manage by guilt. Having been socialized in middle-class ways, executives are conditioned to believe that anger is a no no. When they experience angry feelings, they feel guilty. These sentiments shape the executive's behavior without his knowledge and result in the denial of feedback for subordinates. The significant elements in management by guilt are "disappointment in the man; failure to confront him realistically about his job behavior; procrastination in reaching a decision about him; cover-up to ease the guilt of managerial anger; transfer to another position; finally, discharge."[7] The management by guilt pattern means that principals are unlikely to receive dependable, reliable data about their organizational performance from superiors and in a short period of time principals come to recognize this disquieting fact of organizational life. Gauging personal success is problematic for the principal in consequence.

Unfortunately, the principal's own formal administrative preparation further intensifies his perplexity. Academicians are inclined to treat success in neutral terms, to stress objectivity, and to exhibit the proper scholarly detachment when they discuss success. Principals in training are sensitized to the difference between intermediate and ultimate criteria of success[8] and are exposed to some of the virtues and vices of these two types of criteria. Reasoned neutrality is the rule rather than the exception. The trainee who happens to ask, "But what type of principal is best?", predictably will be told that he has posed the wrong question. The proper question which should be asked is, "When a given type of principal is placed in a given type of situation, on what types of dimensions is he likely to demonstrate certain strengths and weaknesses, as judged by a

[7] Harry Levinson, *Emotional Health in the World of Work* (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964), pp. 267–291.

[8] The classic statement on the criterion issue is Halpin, Andrew W., "A Paradigm for Research on Administrative Behavior" in Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (eds.), *Administrative Behavior in Education* (New York: Harper and Row, 1957), Chapter 5, pp. 155–199.

given set of raters or by a given set of information about the school's functions?" Several studies will be cited to illustrate the point, their limitations will be enumerated, and the caveat will be issued: "More research must be undertaken in this area before we can confidently conclude what leads to successful performance in the principalship in particular types of situations." Educational experiences such as these do not fit the principal to cope with the inevitable puzzlement of how to gauge his success in performing his organizational role.

Consequences for the Principal's Managerial Style

Confronted simultaneously with the strong desire to know how well he is doing and the problematic character of estimating his success within the organization, the principal is impelled to work out ways in which he can reduce the uncertainty about his personal success. How he chooses to solve his success problem is a major determinant of his managerial style. Differences in managerial styles among principals, and we know such differences exist, result from the individual copings and gropings to satisfy the success motive. To understand the principal's managerial style from the perspective of success involves a consideration of four factors: the yardsticks used by the principal to measure his personal success, the capacity of the principal to work without knowledge of results, the beliefs of the principal about cause-result relationships, and the responses the principal makes to known success and failure.

Yardsticks Used to Measure Success

The results principals regard as significant and the yardsticks they use to measure success and failure are as diverse as the line and staff roles pictured on an organizational chart. Some principals may judge the extent of their success by the speed with which they move up the district's administrative ladder and the rung they finally reach. This type of principal engages in GASing (Getting the Attention of Superiors) behavior[9] and is supersensitive to the muted criteria which his superiors use in judging effectiveness. These criteria guide the choices the principal makes about how to allocate his time and efforts. The GASer makes heavy investments in what he deems to be high pay-off activities and slights responsibilities which are not likely to win him points with higher-ups in the district. The specific make-up of the GASer's managerial style becomes apparent only when his version of the organization's unenunciated reward system is known.

[9] Daniel E. Griffiths, *et al.*, "Teacher Mobility in New York City," *Educational Administration Quarterly,* I, 1, 15–31.

Other principals may view their success in terms of their progress through the profession; these principals, unlike the GASers, are career-bound rather than place-bound. To facilitate his mobility to more and more prestigious roles within the profession, the career-bound individual may behave in one of several ways. For example, a career-bound principal may seek regional and national visibility for himself and his school. He leaps aboard every bandwagon and earns a reputation for being an enlightened maverick. He prides himself on rocking the boat; and if it capsizes, he is always aboard another *S. S. Change*, steaming full-speed ahead for more personal fame and success.

A third possible yardstick which a principal might use is the opinions of subordinates. The principal who records his success in these terms looks carefully at the satisfaction exhibited by his subordinates. He wants people to feel good about his school as a place to work, and he attaches great importance to the feelings of self-fulfillment which they experience in doing their work. He, unlike the GASer, is willing to act as their advocate and does not hesitate to confront his superiors if he believes that the welfare of his subordinates is at stake. He is sensitive to the goals of his subordinates and is anxious to please them. Because of the priority he assigns to their feelings, he may even set aside the interests of the organization when these come into conflict with individual goals and concerns.

There are other principals who measure their success by how smoothly their school runs. These "efficiency experts" pride themselves on having a predictable, well-organized, and synchronized environment. They carefully attend to details and derive immense personal satisfaction from bureaucratizing the organization's operations. They develop rules, systematize procedures, and elaborate policies. They experience a strong sense of accomplishment when people conform to regulations, when people know what is expected of them, and when things happen as planned and scheduled. Success for these principals is the attainment of order and predictability in organizational life.

These four illustrations by no means exhaust the universe of possible yardsticks which principals use to gauge their personal success. Undoubtedly subsequent research will uncover types which resemble and differ from the ones I have cited. The most interesting results, however, are likely to be those which focus on the consequencies of a given yardstick for the principal's managerial style and organizational behavior.

Capacity to Work Without Knowledge of Results

A second major factor which influences the character of a principal's managerial style is his capacity to function effectively in his role without

knowledge of results. As I maintained earlier, the principal searches for knowledge of results because of the economic, social, and psychological meanings his work has for him; frequently, he searches in vain. How he responds to a condition of limited or no knowledge of results has consequences for his performance as a principal.

Some principals can exercise discretion for long periods of time and be unaffected by a lack of information about the consequences of their actions. They are content to act with little or no knowledge of how well they are doing and experience minimal discomfort when they have no idea of the effects of their performance. These individuals can function effectively for a lengthy time span[10] without any evidence of success or failure. Other principals function best when they have full knowledge of the wisdom of their actions. They bog down if they have no feedback about the consequences of what they have been doing. These people become unsettled, if not unglued, unless there is somewhat immediate knowledge of results. They are unable to sustain performance without fairly regular evidence that they are succeeding or failing.

Just as principals vary in their capacity to work without knowledge of results, the myriad possible activities associated with the role of school principal vary in their potential for yielding information about success and failure. For example, a principal may know in less than an hour how well he handled an irate parent. He may wait three or four months before he learns whether he made a wise choice in the secretary he hired. He may go a year or two without any really clear picture of how effective his decision was to re-organize the school schedule. He may wait three to five years before he knows the successfulness of his efforts to change the direction and character of his school.

When we combine these differences in the feedback-potential of various activities with the differences among principals in their capacity to function effectively without feedback, we can begin to set some idea of how these differences can influence what a principal chooses to do in his organizational role. The principal who wants to know in a relatively short period of time the results of his actions may busy himself with routine activities which provide immediate tangible results. He may spend a great deal of time on clerical matters and attack personnel problems with gusto. He burdens himself with day-to-day matters that generate a quick pay-off and neglects the intermediate and general planning activities which may give continuity to his actions over time. He does not labor over long-range goals which can offer no clear-cut evidence of attainment, nor does he set

[10] Elliott Jacques, *Measurement of Responsibility* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1956).

goals which entail long periods of uncertainty before success or failure can be assessed. He is unwilling to introduce changes that involve a lengthy time span during which it is difficult to ascertain the extent of success or failure.

Another principal may experience little stress or discomfort when he exercises discretion that yields no immediate knowledge of results. This type of individual may actually thrive, rather than break down, when discharging responsibility over an extended period of time in a climate of uncertainty. He finds activities which provide almost immediate results easy and dull. He, therefore, invests his energies in activities that inherently involve a passing of time before the goodness of his discretion and judgment can be determined.

In reality most principals fall somewhere between these two extremes. However, my basic point should obtain. The capacity of principals to function effectively in situations with varying degrees of uncertainty about results should be related to the activities which they undertake and avoid. These activities constitute another dimension of the principal's managerial style.

Beliefs About Cause-Result Relationships

A third factor which shapes the principal's managerial style is his decisional premises. By decisional premises I mean the principal's personal beliefs about what will produce the results he seeks. For these premises to guide his actions, the principal does not need to have a firm idea about how or why the presumed cause effects the desired results, nor must he possess evidence which corroborates his assumptions. A sufficient basis for action is his own personal belief that there is a connection between a particular cause and the result he desires. Conceivably two principals who use the same yardsticks to appraise their success may have divergent decisional premises. Therefore, to understand the principal's managerial style, we need to know his decisional premises, as well as how he is inclined to measure his success. Let me give several illustrations to clarify this point.

In an earlier section, I mentioned that some principals gauge their success by the morale exhibited by their staff members. These principals may differ, however, in their premises about how morale is built and maintained. One principal may believe that people are most satisfied when they have a clear notion of what the institution's goals are and what procedures they are to follow in achieving these goals. The principal seeks to build morale by delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his staff and by establishing well-defined patterns of organiza-

tion, channels of communication, and methods of procedure.[12] On the other hand, another principal who defines success in terms of his subordinates' morale might believe that these results are brought about by consideration.[13] He does personal favors for staff members and looks out for their welfare. He makes staff members feel at ease when talking with them. He spends time listening to their problems and difficulties; he both empathizes and sympathizes.

Other principals may use a radically different set of results to judge their personal success. They define their own success by the intellectual performance of students in their school. One type of principal may believe that satisfactory results are obtained by routinely letting the staff know what the performance of students is and how it deviates from the expected standards of performance. He sets up procedures for gathering information about system performance, monitors what is happening, and sees that staff members are acting intelligently upon the information at their disposal. Another principal may believe that he contributes to the intellectual performance of students by checking upon staff members to see that their behavior matches the expectations for their role. He sees that courses of study are being followed, that available materials and resources are being used, and that recommended procedures are in effect.

These examples are but a few of the many decisional premises which orient the behavior of principals. Such premises represent an untapped resource for understanding their managerial style. In the past the research community has struggled to establish connections between administrative practices and organizational outcomes. Through these efforts social scientists have sought to provide administrators with empirically substantiated decisional premises. At the same time scholars have neglected to study the cause-result relationships which are fixed in the minds of administrators through the informal hypothesis testing that inevitably occurs in the world of work. If we can direct our attention to these decisional premises, I suspect that we will take one small step, if not one giant leap, in unraveling the mystery of the principal's managerial style.

[11] For two interesting discussions of decisional premises, see Manley Howe Jones, *Executive Decision Making* (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1962), pp. 56–96, and James D. Thompson and Arthur Tuden, "Strategies, Structures, and Processes of Organizational Decision" in *Readings in Managerial Psychology* (eds.) Harold J. Leavitt and Louis R. Pondy (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964) pp. 496–515.

[12] Andrew W. Halpin, *Theory and Research in Educational Administration* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1966), pp. 81–130.

[13] *Ibid.*

Response to Success and Failure

To complete my conceptual map for exploring the principal's managerial style from the perspective of success, I wish to focus on how principals respond when they receive information about the results of their actions. I shall examine failure as well as success, for recent psychological studies point clearly to the significant role disappointment plays in the evolution of a career.[14]

In order to understand a principal's response to success and failure, we need to return for a moment to the more general phenomenon of success and failure. Objective achievement does not necessarily correlate with the feeling of success or failure. "The same achievement can result once in the feeling of great success, another time in the feeling of complete failure."[15] Furthermore, the same achievement can be a success for one person and a failure for another. For example, a high jumper may leap 6′4″. He may experience success for his feat at the beginning of the track season and experience failure if the performance is repeated near the end of the season. On the other hand, another high jumper may deem himself successful if he can occasionally jump at this height. What determines whether an achievement is regarded as a success or as a failure depends upon the relationship between the achievement and the person's level of aspiration. The results sought, as well as the results achieved, shape the individual's response to information about the outcomes of his actions.

With the knowledge that aspiration has exceeded performance, the principal may react in several ways depending upon the magnitude of the disappointment. One principal may rid himself of the feeling of failure by rejecting his responsibility for the outcome. For example, such a principal might be by-passed for a coveted promotion. To maintain his sense of self-adequacy, he attributes the disappointing result to someone having a grudge against him or to the organization's lack of appreciation for his dedication and service. If he reaches conclusions of this kind, he may alter his managerial style drastically. He adapts by developing an "I don't care" attitude. He reduces his commitment to the organization and is content to do no more than is necessary to retain his present position.

Acceptance of personal responsibility for the failure is another possible response. The principal who blames himself for his failure may lower his self-confidence and self-esteem. If he comes to doubt his ability to achieve the results he desires, he may re-set his goals and become satisfied with a

[14] Gregory Rochlin, *Griefs and Discontents* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1965).

[15] Lewin, "The Psychology of Success and Failure," p. 26.

much lower level of performance. A fairly extreme reaction might be for the principal to withdraw completely from similar situations which involve the risk of success or failure.

Diminished self-confidence is not the necessary consequence of assuming personal responsibility for one's own failures, however. The outcome may be positive for the principal if it leads to reorganization of self based on insight.[16] Some principals have internal resources which sustain them as they endure this painful process of self-examination. One writer describes these inner resources as "skyhooks," those intangible somethings deep inside the individual and beyond reason that support a person when the going gets tough.[17] By bolstering the individual during a time of personal crisis, these "skyhooks" enable him to react to failure by engaging in constructive introspection. He can study the situation carefully to identify how his behavior contributed to the disappointing outcome. He can use the occasions of failure to foster self-growth and development, and the insight he achieves adds to the confidence that he shows when he approaches his next task.

Principals' responses to success are also varied. One principal might be inclined to set unrealistic and unattainable goals for himself subsequently. His sense of accomplishment prompts him to overestimate his capabilities. His aspiration level soars in consequence and destines him to failure. Another principal might attribute his success to good fortune and, as a result, act conservatively in the goals he sets because he expects the law of averages to be against him in the future. Still another principal might be spurred to analyze what led to his success in the expectation that he will be able to repeat the performance or to reach a slightly higher goal if he thoroughly understands the ingredients of his present success.

In his life time, the principal will encounter both success and disappointment. Some of these events will be minor episodes in his career while others will be major turning points in the principal's occupational life cycle. If we can uncover how principals respond to these various types of events and why they react as they do, we should deepen our understanding of the principal's managerial style and the minor or drastic changes which occur in it.

Summary

In conclusion I would like to summarize the essential points of my argument. Man has a strong desire to know how well he is doing in the world of

[16] Abraham Zaleznik, "Management of Disappointment." *Harvard Business Review*, 45, 6 (November-December), 1967, 59–70.

[17] O. A. Ohmann, "Skyhooks," *Harvard Business Review*, 48, 1 (January-February), 1970, 4–22, 166.

work, for success has important economic, social, and psychological meanings for him. Man's desire for knowledge of results is not easily satisfied, however. The principal, in particular, has difficulty in gauging his personal success because of certain conditions prevalent in educational organizations. These conditions are aggravated by some specific features of training programs for educational administrators. Because of the problematic character of estimating his success within the organization and his simultaneous urge to know whether he is successful, the principal is impelled to work out ways in which he can reduce the uncertainty about his personal success. How he chooses to solve his success problem is a major determinant of his managerial style. His solution and his resultant managerial style are most productively understood in terms of four factors: the yardsticks he uses to measure his personal success, his capacity to function effectively without knowledge of results, his beliefs about cause-result relationships, and his responses to known success and failure.[18]

[18] Personal success has been used in two ways throughout the paper. One is "objective success" which refers to the attainment of valued results. A second is "subjective success" which refers to the sense of well-being that accompanies the attainment of valued results. I have not felt the need to use an adjectival qualifier for success in the paper as the meaning of success should be evident in the context in which it is used.

CHAPTER IV

VIEWING THE SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP

CONRAD BRINER*

The task of developing a theory-model viewpoint on educational administration delineated as the school principalship is far from simple. The main difficulty is in locating conceptual and emotional vantage points that are compatible theoretically and representative of realities out there. I muse: the difficulty is like searching for your fiancee in a large crowd when you know your prospective mother-in-law is guarding her. You are eager to be with her, the two of you alone. But you are not sure of mother's power—the environmental peril. The uncertainty you feel reflects the importance and complexity of the situation.

Similarly, viewing the principalship can be both an experience of anticipation and frustration. The essentiality of schooling to a healthy society can stir an overwhelming impulse to lead, but the uncertainty of environmental traps and pitfalls can cause timid, if not cowardly, behavior. The result usually is a polite and cautious administrative style; honesty and feeling are masked by the custom of routine.

I try here to avoid such a personal failure by briefly noting first certain analytical problems relevant to viewing the school principalship. I draw from these problems conceptual guidelines within which I illustrate the principalship by personalized interpretation and valuing of its characteristics.

In theory building there is usually the analytical problem of being "scientific"—projecting methodological objectivity. This can entail testing specified hypotheses by controlled observation, analysis and experimentation. A crucial assumption is that verified hypotheses (laws) will fit together into a theoretical structure. Several conceptual difficulties are involved: No clear picture exists of the variables critical to administrative behavior, and the social sciences are of little help yet in remedying this problem. All in all, the nature of educational administration is obscured by the dilemma of having to map limited data into a simple order and yet asking of the data whether they satisfy both simple and complex orders.

Additionally there is difficulty in finding isomorphic theories or models. The seminal meaning of a theory with laws which are structurally similar

* Mr. Briner is Professor and Chairman, Faculty in Education, Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California.

to another theory (and therefore operating on the same principles) prompts the possibility that models are loose talk unless the relevance of the phenomena being compared is made clear.

There is difficulty in knowing how administrative theory is of value in determining organizational processes. Commentary upon the history of science suggests that scientific rigor rarely appears in discovery and application; it appears *a posteriori* or as a means of fereting out the significant factors of a past behavior and evincing them in defensible form. Can an administrative theory (nomic-empirical generalizations) provide a logic-for-use or just a means of reconstructing and thereby explaining in circular fashion any particular group of behaviors? Can the *concepts* of administrative theory have clear attributes? The meanings of terms such as "management" and "efficiency" are not easily discovered or subject to generalization.

It seems, then, that strict adherence to rules of theory building and evaluation have limited utility in viewing the principalship. An alternative intellectual posture is to view administration as a behavioral art. But to champion administration as an art ignores the evident discrepancies between best hunches and predictions based upon appropriate data and established theory. Human behavior is not so unique as to be incapable of prediction. General determinants of human behavior and behavior-shaping contexts are known. One could consult the behaviors of those deemed artful in decision making. But this would reveal little unless the rationale for the actual behavior were known or discernible.

With apologies to scientists and artists and their devotees. I choose to view administrative behavior, knowledge and skill, as both scientifically and humanistically derived. Following is an attempt to illustrate this bias by abstract consideration of organization and then application to the school and principalship.

How can organization achieve education? This question is obviously crucial to the viability of administration. The answers available range from man's putative social propensity to organize to achieve economy to the assertation that man joins groups because he desires to fulfill certain personal needs. The question, however, does not necessarily call for a probe of the human psyche; rather it asks what organization can do which an individual cannot. The answer is roughly that organizations permit differentiated but integrated activities. As a result, they allow simultaneously for the plural number of events required for some acts. What the acts will be and how they will be executed depends upon adaptation within the organization and adjustment to the environment. To understand a viable organization one must, therefore, account for both environmental and individual factors relevant to the organization's workings.

An initial step is to consider the distinctives of relevant physical and cultural characteristics. A molar description of historical and sociological factors would explain this. A molecular approach would reveal the needs and drives of those who participate in the organization. In this context, the administrator represents both the established community and the agents of purposive change. The administrator has a *political* position. He is not only the arbitrator between the educational and the larger communities, he is a leader in reaching beyond the confines of both to the fulfillment of individuals. The administrator is both scientist and artist in these endeavors fraught with ambiguity. He is engaged in a game of strategy rather than fitting circumstances into a master jigsaw puzzle. Puzzles are non-interactional. Each piece is unique in design and character; each fits but one space. To administer along puzzle lines would be to attempt to lead an organization without questioning the organization's purposes. To administer along game lines requires significant interaction for the sake of redefining goals, procedures, responsibility and authority. The administrator is then not an agent trying to make things come out right; rather he strives to accommodate people as they are and as they can become.[1]

In focusing this conceptual orientation more elaborately upon the school principalship, first let's take stock of different ways educators are viewed: as Socratic (a seeker of truth), as revolutionary (an agent of social change), as priest (a possessor of the myths of the tribe), as existential (a person in the process of becoming himself). For the administrators, particularly principals, they can be imagined in the kneeling posture of Polonius at the Danish court. How a principal and other educators might arise from this position is now the subject of this analysis.

While it is possible, grocery list fashion, to name roles, describe behavior traits accompanying each role, and the nature of the organization which will emerge in each case, a list of such possibilities is not particularly instructive without reference to present events and conditions. A more popular endeavor is the questioning of the relationship among the individual, his educational organizations, and the state. It is clear that education has been the province of the state for at least a century, and one is compelled (or condemned) to be educated in our society. However, it appears that the relationship among these three factors could soon begin to fluctuate wildly.

For many years compulsory education has seemed practical and desirable. The state has explained to each student how his society, his body,

[1] Omar K. Moore, "Some Puzzling Aspects of Social Interaction," *Review of Metaphysics,* XV (March, 1962), pp. 409–433.

his care, his universe worked, and even more important, it explained to the student what to do with his body and soul as he became a citizen of the state; the state usually did these things without the child's consent. Ultimately, both the individual and educational organizations became arms of the state. All was well until great numbers of individuals, especially since the war in Vietnam, began to question the authority and moral position of the state at all levels and to assert that they as individuals had the right and the duty to make choices the state had previously made for them, i.e., numbers of people asserted that they as individuals had the right and were better qualified to determine what they would become. One can note numbers of exponents of this position by reading front-page news. I mean by this the possibility that the roles of the individual, the administrator and the state in education are up for grabs these days. Implicit in this observation are needed new decisions about the propriety of compulsory education, the meaning of academic freedom, and the services which schools must supply.

To retrace a bit, consider the traditional role of administrators in order to see how deeply we have adopted the view that the individual and education are functionaries of the state and in order to understand the potential failings inherent in such a view. In the United States the common school, to the best of my knowledge, has been always conceived as an institution for the perpetuation of the values and customs of America, i.e., prepetuation of the state. If one has made even a cursory review of educational literature or had any public school experience, he may with considerable justification conclude that the field of education is inhabited almost solely by woolly-minded bureaucrats who define education as having something to do with telling children the truths of the race:

> But if you will enter the lists in dead earnest, if you will take once again the interest in education that your grandfathers and grandmothers took, if you will support in every positive way those who are trying to break the bonds of pragmatic and permissive progressive education throughout this country, then education will in absolute truth assume its ancient role in this great land as the mentor and handmaiden of the American way of life.[2]

This behavior, exalted by Mr. Max Rafferty as the only honest purpose of education, is defensive, ceremonial and largely irrelevant because it seeks only to preserve what is or what was. This admonition is directed to administrators as well as for children but usually disguised by a vocabulary of order, efficiency and duty.

[2] Max Rafferty, *What They Are Doing to Your Children* (New York: New American Library, 1963), p. 9.

For example, traditional educational writers suggest that the principal is an important man who takes care of virtually everything in an orderly way.

> The *principal* should be recognized as an instructional leader, staff officer, and as the dean of his faculty. He also has line functions in that he is the administrative officer to whom all teachers are directly responsible.[3]
> There is no basic difference except in scope of authority and specific responsibilities between the superintendent and the principal. However, primarily for reasons of accounting, budget classification, and also in imitation of commercial or army organization, the superintendent, deputy, associate, and district superintendents are considered *general* officers, while the building principals are classified as *field* or line officers.[4]

On closer inspection, however, we discover that the principal is usually a man who is delegated all responsibility, but no power to fulfill it. The principal's position is quite hollow and, like a priest, he is only the defender of higher authority. Being thus dependent, his eyes are ever cast upward and with little concern for those below him.

> General supervision of all teachers, clerks, custodians, cafeteria managers and helpers, other certificated and non-certificated members of his staff [is the duty of the principal]. Except when engaged in teaching a class he shall devote his entire time to the general administration and supervision of the school. . . . As a representative of the Superintendent and the Board of Education, *he is expetced to support and carry out the decisions and policies both in letter and in spirit. All disputed questions in matters of discipline, classification, grading, etc., shall be referred to the Superintendent, whose decisions shall be final.*[5] [*Italics mine.*]

The dilemma of the principal reflects the larger dilemma of the social institution, education: as presently organized and managed, formal education is largely irrelevant to the individual in terms of his intrinsic worth. Rather, formal education is ceremonial—an extended Bar Mitzvah, but less efficacious perhaps, because the student experiences little sense of passage. Particularly at present, students and administrators alike are the victims of anti-intellectual and anti-humanist social and political forces in the school community. Only in rare instances is public education truly intellectually stimulating or, more important, emotionally satisfying for

[3] Calvin Grieder, Truman Pierce and William Everett Rosenstengel, *Public School Administration* (New York: Ronald Press Co., 1961), p. 265.

[4] Arthur B. Moehlman, *School Administration: Its Development, Principles and Future in the United States* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1940), p. 288.

[5] *Principal's Handbook,* San Diego Unified School District, San Diego, California (no date), p. 3.

administrator, teacher or student. Few know what is education in America because it is a patchwork of everything we have tried; administrators therefore are in the position of justifying its vagaries by the almost unlimited specialized rhetoric of bureaucracy.

A major fault is that education is treated ritualistically, the administrator being a ritual chief charged with yielding to community pressure, setting a social example, performing trivial tasks, enforcing the roles of other staff members, and concentrating on rules rather than people. He represents a system which outlines the sacred cows, socializes the child to accept authority and a sense of his own insignificance without question, and "prepares" him to "make a living." Thus, in eight, twelve, sixteen, or twenty years we "produce" citizens who observe rituals and discuss topics analytically, but who are dead spiritually and emotionally. Nowhere in our public schools is there room for emotional learning, all social-democratic pseudo-liberal humanitarian talk to the contrary, because this kind of education does not fit in with our national beliefs in efficiency and work or with our traditional ideas about organizations. The principal is as much a victim of this system as the children because his role is the incarnation of the problem. As an individual he is practically powerless because of being beholden to anonymous authority on all sides. His tasks are largely menial and in the long-run not very important. One often hears staff members remark, "What does the principal *do*, anyway?" Obviously, men who could be described as alive would not be attracted to this position; the nature of the job decrees that a principal must be a cipher. Take, for example, the year-end memo at a California high school which came from the principal's office. It declared fearfully that if teachers allowed students to leave classes early, the teachers would be penalized a day's salary. The memo suggests either non-thinking behavior or the principal's fear of disorder and uncertainty about what to do if it should arise. The memo reveals, too, the principal's means of influence: fear and repression, the same means used to control students. But amazingly the principal usually does not have the authority to enact such a threat. Yet he alone or in the habit of his office only is reinforcing the mindless fear of which he is himself a product; accordingly the school's educational endeavor inevitably sinks further into the prehistoric ooze of fear and repression which spawned it. This traditional role is thus non-intellectual, non-emotional, defensive and hence self-justifying, powerless, and unrewarding. It occupies the weakest of all ethical positions, the preservation of the status quo, and can offer neither enlightenment nor sustenance in the changes of time. In this sense, it is positively dangerous to the welfare of society.

If all of this is true, then we might look at what other definitions of organization have to offer by way of improvement. I mentioned above the Socratic method, but this style is almost exclusively intellectual. It is highly reasonable, and commendable as a technique, but it does not allow full emotional expression. Still it is much more appealing than the revolutionary approach which, while it allows for growth and change, does not provide stability, and also runs the risk of being as doctrinaire as the traditional system. It is not sufficiently concerned with individual development. Furthermore, an organization planned for solving social problems may offer a solution to current problems but not necessarily long term or future ones. Personally, I find most appealing the view that education is an existential experience, a process of becoming oneself which does not end with formal schooling. This process is not exclusively intellectual but includes all facets of man's existence. Therefore, it seems appropriate that the school provide for more than just one dimension of the child, if, indeed, we are interested in nurturing citizens who will be both productive and happy.

Modern industrial society does not resemble the tribe nor the family nor pre-industrial society nor agricultural society. It is large, anonymous, and smoothly functioning (despite occasional riots among its non-industrial members). Its major characteristics in individual terms are perhaps loneliness and alienation. (This is true even of marriage). There is little in a large bureaucracy which nourishes the inner life of the individual, and many individuals begin to assume they have no inner life, and that their unhappiness, which they usually do not acknowledge because such behavior is socially unacceptable, comes from outside themselves. They conclude that their unhappiness is something that can be remedied by possessions or hedonism. But it is the inner life which determines the quality of existence, and, if this inner life is ignored, no amount of affluence will suffice it. Only fulfillment of life's basic needs—love, acceptance, self-expression—will. To the extent that education ignores these needs (and all of these needs are more important to the process of education as society becomes increasingly sterile and bureaucratized), the individual, while more knowledgeable, will be less able to deal with his society and himself. I am suggesting here that the role of the public school must adapt to the changing environment.

In other words, the principal must look hard at the relationship between the individual, the state, and the school. As the family disintegrates as a source of inner nourishment and until an alternative such as types of communes based on choice—an extended family—is more fully realized, the school could take on a different function in order to meet the needs of individuals in this society. I find students suffering more from loneliness than

from lack of books, more from the desire to talk to someone and have someone take an interest in them than from "permissiveness" or the results of "progressivism." The principal, then, must propose a possible method of organization whereby the school and the administration of it could more adequately fulfill the inner needs of the individuals being served. Probably new assumptions about the state, the school, and the student are required.

First, the state and its institutions must exist to serve the individual. Education which best serves the individual ultimately best serves the state. Second, he individual has free will and has therefore the ability and the power to choose his way of life within the bounds of his circumstances. He will thus profit most by that education, i.e., process of development, which allows him to fulfill and express his self as he, like his fellows, proceeds toward his destiny whatever it may be. It may be argued that this is already one of the basic tenets of our national philosophy, it having been asserted that all men have the right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." It is, therefore, the function of the state to assist the individual in availing himself of that right. Third, man is basically good and he will act toward his own good and toward that of others if he is treated kindly and if his environment is relatively free of unwarranted fear or repression. I submit that the state has the duty to assure that there is at least one institution in which men can be themselves if only in order that the state may survive.

There is a precedent argument which supports this conclusion: There is not necessarily a conflict between inculcating the lore of the tribe, sound citizenship, and the exercise of individual choice. If one is allowed to live the lore of the tribe—freedom—it will be virtually impossible for one to become something else—unfree. It seems to me that the repression in the schools which we now condone and support does more to contradict our belief in freedom of the individual than any alternative institution might. Thus, the conflict between the needs of individuals and the needs of society in this case is specious.

What a principal could suggest is a method of school organization based upon a "free" system. I use *free* to mean what A. S. Neill calls self-regulation: "The right of a child to live freely, without outside authority in things psychic and somatic . . . that to impose anything by authority is wrong. The child should not do anything until he comes to the opinion—his own opinion—that is what should be done." The plan I outline is based on selected principles of Neill's own school, Summerhill.

1. . . . a firm faith "in the goodness of the child" . . .
2. The aim of education—in fact the aim of life—is to work joyfully and to find happiness. . . .
3. In education, intellectual development is not enough. . . .

4. Education must be geared to psychic needs and capacities of the child. . . .
5. Discipline, dogmatically imposed, and punishment create fear; and fear creates hostility. . . .
6. Freedom does not mean license. . . .
7. Closely related to this principle is the need for true sincerity on the part of the teacher. . . .
8. Healthy human development makes it necessary that a child eventually cut the primary ties which connect him with his father and mother, or with later substitutes in society, and that he become truly independent. . . .
9. Guilt feelings primarily have the function of binding the child to authority. . . .
10. Summerhill School does not offer religious education. . . .[6]

The most obvious implication of these principles is, of course, the elimination of compulsory education. The school would then become a place where individuals meet by choice and with a common purpose, and would not be, as it is now, a regulatory, and in many cases, penal institution. Obviously, discipline problems would be largely solved by the members of the school themselves, so that the principal would be immediately relieved of one of his traditional duties and his role, like other members of the institution becomes one of living. Once education becomes non-compulsory, it no longer needs to be apologized for, and each educational community can then work to solve its own problems. The issue of academic freedom would not arise in the form it does now because as individuals sense that they have power over their lives, they are not fearful of ideas different from their own.

Once education does not have to be justified by invoking classical beliefs, the principal's customary activities are drastically reduced. The need for testing, grading, and other forms of coercion for which he is usually tacitly responsible will also be eliminated. The school will still need equipment and material and accompanying bookkeeping, but this is a relatively minor infringement on the principal's time and the state's budget. Similarly, the principal will no longer be the community apologist for the school. Since it is a voluntary association, he need not seek to make people want to support it and him, as he now feels compelled to do, often at the expense of his staff and students. Being sponsored by the state, the school will be available to all, and once it becomes an attractive place in which to be, people will willingly populate it. If one could spend his time in a place where he is loved and approved and allowed to be himself, why would he choose to be elsewhere? This feeling applies to adults as well as to children, and once we have an institution which is what the family now pretends to be, I submit that the principal as well as other members of the staff will want to fulfill themselves in their own ways. Perhaps the principal's main

[6] A. S. Neill, *Summerhill* (New York: Hart Publishing Co., 1960), pp. xii–xiii.

problem will be to have time to himself since there will be many demands from publics including students and teachers to be incorporated in the school. Primarily, however, his job will be to understand the nature of freedom and to set a tone or atmosphere consistent with it. He will have to have much knowledge of himself and of other people and he will have to take a personal part in the events of the school. Unlike the principal, many of the members of the bureaucratic hierarchy of the school should be eliminated or sharply reduced in order that fear may be eliminated. Everyone is to acknowledge the individuality and integrity of all others; obviously, this does not preclude common sense and adult action where children are incapable.

Lest I be accused of offensive naivete, I hasten to confess my reservations about the feasibility of this plan for American schools. The first defect of this plan is, of course, the fact that the vast majority of our citizens do not want to be free and do not want their children to be free. It would be easy to finance this kind of school—easier in fact than the kind we now support. It would be possible to find staff. There is no question that children would be pleased. Parents, however, would fear that they could no longer control their children, and indeed they couldn't because the children would learn to believe in themselves and not to be afraid. Until society learned that fear and guilt were evil rather than the behavior which results from them, there would be no doubt be friction. This belief asserts a particular importance of the principal. His job would also be to protect the school and the children from such people who fear that freedom is dangerous, for they will no doubt try to destroy the school.

Another difficulty may be reconciling state support with a concept of education which implies less state control of schools than we now enjoy. But on this score, most legislators I know would be more attracted to this choice than would be the public at large.

A third difficulty is training personnel. Present licensing requirements would need to be eliminated and little substituted except programs supporting voluntary self discovery and classification. I am convinced that once one has found his way out of much of his own guilt and fear he is better equipped to deal with his fellow man than he is by all the combined pedagogic and administration courses now in existence. By virtue of the fact that one lives in this society, he is automatically trained in bureaucracy. What is needed in education is to be untrained in bureaucracy so that one may respond authentically as himself and not as a role-dominated actor.

A fourth difficulty is philosophical. The Western mind describes life lineally and sees in this view the possibility of controlling all aspects of life.

This view of the world at first seems inconsistent with belief in the individual to become himself. To each his own, would be life "out of control." While in a superficial sense this is true, in a deeper sense all of life can be seen as being a tied-together part of the same whole, which is to say we need not fear superficial disparity.

I conclude finally that if we are to achieve organization such as described here, the principal cannot imagine or strive for one particular school model, because each school embodies essentially the people in it who will be self determining and self regulating. What suits the choice of the group within the institution and its environment becomes the fulfillment of that group, just as the choice of activity by the individual becomes his fulfillment. In other words, in allowing ourselves self development, we do not have to promise what we shall become, since we shall become what we are individually and collectively. This criterion of accommodating individuals will guide the principal as he assesses school goals, structures and consequences and decides upon strategies of continual reform.

CHAPTER V

EDUCATIONAL REFORM AND THE PRINCIPAL

LUVERN L. CUNNINGHAM*

Introduction[1]

We live in an age in which most forms of authority, control and leadership are challenged. The assault on "establishments" has always been a popular sport but seldom have so many systems of authority attracted so much distrust simultaneously.

The judicial system has been shaken as badly as any. The trial of the Chicago Seven produced public uncertainty about justice, about jurists, and about the legal profession itself. The Kennedy Chappaquiddick incident, the hearings, and eventual inquest elevated old anxieties (rightly or wrongly) about equality of rich and poor before the law. The search for Supreme Court justices has exposed additional judicial system frailties, embarrassing to the legal profession and to laymen alike.

The administration of public welfare teeters on the rim of collapse in many places. The prospects of violence (indeed sharp physical encounters themselves) are as prominent in this field as in most others. The organization of the recipients of welfare is occurring in most large cities. The invasions of administrative offices, city councils, and state legislatures by welfare mothers and associated fellow travelers has become routine. Father Groppi is a household name in Wisconsin. From the perspective of the establishment he is the new "oleomargarine" in Wisconsin political affairs.

* Mr. Cunningham, Dean of the College of Education, The Ohio State University, was a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California, at the time this paper was written.

[1] I have taken liberty with the title of this paper. (The program indicates the topic to be "Alternative Ways of Organizing Schools with Implications for the Principalship.") This paper, rather than an example of academic elan, has some of the earmarks of a confessional. I have wrestled with the topic, words, assumptions, deadlines—and ended with frustration. The product too perfectly mirrors the vacillation, uncertainty, searchingness that seems to mark academician and practitioner alike in these times. So active are the winds of change in education it seems ill advised to separate concerns for the principalship from the broader set of educationally significant events. Thus these comments relate with greater frequency to larger problems, more remotely to the immediate implications for the principalship. To the extent that this violates the purposes of this seminar, I apologize.

The institutions which deliver health services in the society are the targets of public disdain too. Up to now the confrontations between clients and the health services' bureaucracies have been less physical. Few hospitals or clinics have been bombed; seldom have doctors or nurses been locked in their offices during takeovers. Nevertheless, the health system is under severe scrutiny. Medicare and Medicaid are apparently saturated with administrative malfunction. Their vulnerability to abuse has approached the threshold of national disgrace.[2]

Religious institutions too are under attack. The internal disquiet within the Catholic Church has spilled out across the world. Injustices within the Episcopal fold, especially the defrocking of members of the cloth, were in the public press recently. The seeds of transformations are here and there within and without most religious bodies.

The uptightness about education is so well known that we need only pause to describe briefly the most recent evidence of its weaknesses. Keith Goldhammer has just completed a study of nearly three hundred elementary principals.[3] As most of us could have predicted, he found good schools and bad schools; exceptionally capable principals and some that were unbelievably inept. He noted that several of the best leaders and schools were in unlikely places—rotten, stinking ghettos. Predictably a few of the saddest examples were in good suburbs or silk-stocking sections of cities.

An elementary principal in a border city wore a side arm each day to keep his mostly white pupils in line. At the opposite extreme the head of a school in the toughest part of a large city leads a student body, community, and faculty in a common, successful assault on indescribably difficult educational problems. Each situation is a mirror reflection of the man at the helm.

The Bank of America, ROTC, and inner city PTA's are the targets of anarchists, radicals, reformers, as well as garden variety advocates of change. Violence, abuse, drugs, race become confused with justice, equity, and love. Good guys look like bad guys. Flower children, the counter culture, the Weathermen—temporary phenomenon or the wave of the future? Is today's violence just another peak in America's turbulent history? Who knows? Richard Hofstadter refuses to predict our violence future. He argues that our domestic tempo depends upon external matters—how

[2] See the January, 1970 issue of *Fortune* for a review of the medical profession and its problems.

[3] Keith Goldhammer, et al., *Issues and Problems in Elementary School Administration* (Final Report, Project No. 8–0428, February 1970).

rapidly we can disengage from Vietnam, the world's response to our failure there, and our skill in avoiding similar entanglements.[4]

And so it is with educational turbulence. Maybe it is cyclical; maybe today's disquiet will subside; maybe the traditional American values of achievement, success, hard work, and respect will surface once again.[5] Maybe not.

A Bit About Reforming

Most of us are professor types, possessing modest specializations (organizational theory, political analysis, cost-benefit technology, administrative science) bound together by an affection for educational administration. We are not dedicated reformers. When we choose to apply our concepts, theories, models, or frameworks to phenomena of interest we do so within reasonably antiseptic environments. And some of our better minds lend us a hand from time to time. For example, James Anderson has described several forms of authority (Weberian) in his useful book on education's bureaucracy.[6] The first is "charismatic," the second "traditional," the third "rational-legal." Each of these makes sense to us: we are able to feel their presence from our experience in organizations. Obviously there *is* authority in charisma. (The film *Patton* provides a splendid contemporary example.) Similarly the weight of tradition is powerful and compelling as witness the perpetuation of rituals such as commencements or alumni mumbling through "Hail to Alma Mater." And "rational-legal" authority is chokingly apparent everywhere.

But what about the layman—the reformer out there who is not privy to our tools? He has never heard of James Anderson or Max Weber.

Pro-establishment or not, one can develop sympathies for reformers. Modern institutions (or organizations if you prefer) are frightfully involved. Their complexities overwhelm insiders let alone outsiders who would make them over. If one were a protagonist set upon changing an institution, where would be begin? Schools, although they are floundering institutions, are like angleworms. Despite being cut up they live on. Schools may be the Volkswagons of the institutional industry. They hold the market despite few changes in the basic model.

[4] Richard Hofstadter, "The Future of American Violence," *Harper's*, Vol. 240 (April 1970), p. 52.

[5] This paper reflects some ambivalence on this matter. Its basic thrust however is based on the assumption that institutional transformation within education is just beginning.

[6] James G. Anderson, *Bureaucracy in Education* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968), pp. 1–5.

An operating bureaucracy is the arena where several authority systems interface. Those interfaces either produce harmony or tensions, functional or dysfunctional behaviors. In any event they must be topics of interest for those bent upon reform. The systems within systems, layers upon layers, interfaces upon interfaces are what drive reformers to despair. (The anarchists on the other hand may discover that what they hoped to achieve through the instrument of chaos is already here.)

Why Schools?

Why do we have schools? We have them because persons who preceded us believed that the society (and the individuals who made it up) would be better served if learning were organized. They decided that things to be known were too numerous and too complex to be learned in random, haphazard fashion. They were stimulated by the need to satisfy rather basic needs—food, clothing, shelter, preservation. But beyond those loomed the prospect of conquering frontiers, inquiring into infinite unknowns, and testing the mettle of mind and body against perplexing problems.

Max Rafferty, whatever else one may say about him, has a flare for language. In critiquing A. S. Neill's *Summerhill* he summarily dispatches Neill (and his kind) and simultaneously defends the concept of schooling that we have developed in our society.

Summerhill is old hat, you know. Not new. Not revolutionary. Not even shocking.

It's hard to pinpoint the first educational quack. I suppose the line of frauds goes back well beyond Jean-Jacques Rousseau, but that heartless mountebank will serve as a starting point.

Jean-Jacques was a real character. With an irresponsibility characteristic of his entire philosophy, he fathered several bastards and thoughtfully shunted them into foundling asylums for his more humdrum fellow-citizens to support. At various times he practiced voyeurism, exhibitionism, and masturbation with equally feverish enthusiasm, preserving himself from any legal unpleasantness by pleading softening of the brain. He fought viciously, if verbally, with every normal intellect in Europe, and died insane.

Rousseau spawned a frenetic theory of education which after two centuries of spasmodic laboring brought forth a by-blow in the form of A. S. Neill's neolithic version of the hallowed halls of academe: Summerhill. According to the confused Frenchman, education was running, jumping, shouting, doing as one pleased. The first impulses of nature are always right. Keep the child's mind idle as long as you can. And suchlike rot.

This sort of guff is as old as the human race. The child is a Noble Savage, needing only to be let alone in order to insure his intellectual salvation. Don't inhibit him. Never cross him, lest he develop horrid neuroses later on in life. The cave children

of the Stone age grew up happier, better adjusted, and less frustrated than do ours today, simply because they were in a blissful state of nature. So just leave the kids alone. They'll educate themselves.

Twaddle.

Schooling is not a natural process at all. It's highly artificial. No boy in his right mind ever wanted to study multiplication tables and historical dates when he could be out hunting rabbits or climbing trees. In the days when hunting and climbing contributed to the survival of *homo sapiens,* there was some sense to letting kids do what comes naturally, but when man's future began to hang upon the systematic mastery of orderly subject matter, the primordial, happy-go-lucky, laissez-faire kind of learning had to go. Today it's part and parcel of whatever lost innocence we may ever have possessed. Long gone. A quaint anachronism.[7]

We Americans became insatiable achievers. And schools were our instruments.

Now the achievement ethic is in ill repute among the young, and seriously questioned by a good many others. Why raise the standard of living further? Why venture into space? Why not live? Why not value self and others? Why not end war by refusing to make it? Why not? If the schools are the instruments of achievement and we no longer wish to achieve, then why have schools? A very tough question indeed.

The absence of harmony and the incidence of dysfunctional tensions cause establishment and non-establishment types to argue that there must be a better way. The search for a "better way" and its implications for principals is the object of this exercise.

Reform Concepts: Too Little, Too Late

There are literally hundreds of new institutions either in their early months of life or on the drawing boards. Donald Robinson reports that there are two or three new "alternative" schools born every day.[8] Many are short-lived (average life eighteen months), ill planned, often conceived out of frustration.[9] They represent an "institutional counter culture," and in my judgment we should take them seriously. By themselves however they will not produce the educational reformation most of us are groping for. At best they may test new and old ideas in the short run, and some may continue as established institutions in a sharply reordered educational firmament of the future.

[7] Max Rafferty in Harold H. Hart, ed., *Summerhill: For and Against* (New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc., 1970), pp. 11–12.

[8] Donald W. Robinson, " 'Alternative Schools': Challenge to Traditional Education?" *Phi Delta Kappan,* Vol. LI, No. 7 (March 1970), pp. 374–375.

[9] *Ibid.*

In this section I have chosen to deal with a sampling of concepts and institutional forms chosen from a collage of reforms. As I have indicated I am pessimistic about their individual worth contrasted with what seems to be in order in the way of educational reform.

Apprenticeship. The first of these is apprenticeship as advocated by Howard Becker. In a paper titled "A School is a Lousy Place to Learn Anything In" Becker argues the value of apprenticeship—for everyone in the society.[10] Despite extended passages detailing the weaknesses in our schools and his misgivings about schools he does not quite join forces with the abolitionists.

So that we begin together in the exploration of Becker's ideas, here is his second paragraph:

> The myth schools produce tells us that in school people learn something they would not otherwise know. Teachers, who do know that thing, spend their full time teaching it to their pupils. The myth further explains that schools pass the cultural heritage of our society on to succeeding generations, both the general heritage we acquire in elementary and high school and the more differentiated aspects taught in colleges and graduate and professional schools. Finally, while educators readily admit the shortcomings of schools, they do not conceive that anything in the essence of a school might produce those shortcomings or that any other institutional form might perform the educational job more adequately.[11]

Becker goes on to challenge other prevailing mythologies. He notes that schools (all kinds of schools) do not achieve the results they set out to achieve. His evidence is sketchy but persuasive: Osler Peterson (1957) examined the quality of medical practice among general practitioners in North Carolina and discovered that there was no relation between the medical school that doctors graduated from and the quality of their practice, nor was there a relationship between quality of practice and their rank in medical school graduating classes. Hoffman, studying actors, discovered that almost none of the actors regarded as "good" by their peers ever attended a drama school. Philip Jacob (1957) reviewed hundreds of studies of the influence of college on student values and found little evidence of a liberalizing change. A more recent piece of work by Simon, Gagnon and Carnes (1969) indicates that college experience has almost no influence on political attitudes. Finally Astin (1968) cast considerable doubt on the effect of college on students' intellectual development and learning. Bright

[10] Howard Becker, "A School Is A Lousy Place to Learn Anything In," (Unpublished paper, Autumn, 1969), prepared at The Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, California.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

students do just as well irrespective of the college they enter. The same is true for "dull" ones. The variation in academic ability on entrance entirely accounts for the difference in the Graduate Record Examination scores of graduates of different schools.

To explain this dismal record Becker wonders if the organization of the school is the villain. Universal curricula, patterned movement, standardized evaluations, rigid authority structures, and obsolete reward systems are cited as likely causes.

The chief alternative to learning things in school is to learn them on the job, especially if on-the-job training is defined broadly. The person doing the learning is the apprentice. Becker does not limit the term to its normal usage in a unionized trade. Thus an apprentice would learn from people, where they are, from whatever they do. Becker reports comprehensively on iron worker and meat cutter apprenticeships. He notes their deficiencies as well as their virtues. One of the most severe limitations is that no one is required to teach; another is the harshness of the socialization process. The virtues include relevancy, individualization ,and immediate and sustained performance evaluation.

Becker acknowledges that there are severe problems in schooling and in apprenticing. He concedes that we will always have schools because we will always find ourselves in the dilemma of preparing people for unknown futures. He concludes "that schools may be lousy places to learn anything in" but so are apprenticeships. The question which he leaves to the likes of us is: Can there be a more fundamental linking of these two educational forms?

Residential Schools. The residential school is hardly a new educational form. Private residential, high prestige schools exist throughout the world. They are sometimes coeducational, sometimes special purpose serving. Those like Summerhill are residential, coeducational, and philosophically distinct.[12]

Summerhill has produced a cult. The celebrated A. S. Neill, Summerhill's founder and living patron saint, joins John Dewey, Jean Piaget, and Maria Montessori in their ability to provoke discipleship. Persons feel so deeply about Neill's educational philosophy and Summerhill's practices that many efforts to reproduce Summerhill will occur. The bitterness of Summerhill's critics likewise promises to enrich the debate. And in subtle ways it will affect the revolution.

[12] A. S. Neill, *Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing* (New York: Hart Publishing Company, Inc. 1960).

John Holt is a convert. He argues that the key words are "to begin." "We must therefore take Neill's thought, his writing, his work, and Summerhill itself, not as a final step, but as a first one."[13] Max Rafferty (quoted earlier on Summerhill) observes that ". . . . Summerhill is a dirty joke. It degrades true learning to the status of a disorganized orgy. It turns a teacher into a sniggering projectionist of a stag movie. It transforms a school into a cross between a beer garden and a boiler factory. It is a caricature of education."[14] Bruno Bettelheim blends respect with cautious restraint in his appraisal of Summerhill. Bettelheim is a phenomenal educational theorist and practitioner himself, heading the most unique residential school in the world for severely disturbed children. Bettelheim reveals disappointment in the bunglings of his own disciples and predicts that Neill will experience the same fate. He sees Summerhill and Neill as inseparable. He believes that Summerhill's successes have never been recorded nor can they be. Neill's gifts are so subtle that they are not even known to himself, thus they cannot be shared. (The same could be said of Bettelheim.) Far from an unqualified endorsement Bettelheim disagrees with Summerhill's emphasis on unrestrained heterosexual experience and complete freedom. Contrary to John Holt, he urges Neill's followers not to try "to set his philosophy into deadly practice."[15]

The discussion of Summerhill is offered as an example of a particular form of schooling. Controversial to the extreme, it will likely attract a host of imitators despite admonitions to the contrary. Like Montessori there will be Neill schools in many places. And in my judgment rightly so if we wish to take seriously our commitment to diversity in educational forms. Such schools would not be inimical to large scale reforms reviewed later.

Quite a different semi-residential school has been designed by Systems Development Corporation in Santa Monica. It differs sharply from Summerhill in philosophy and clientele. It is hard to label this school. Its planners call it an experimental school for urban poor. Its designers are for the most part non-educators. And as I read their description I found myself alternately pleased and astounded. Pleased at the blending of promising ideas in a single design—astounded that they were being advanced as new.

In brief the school is to serve severely disadvantaged people; to include those traditionally enrolled in grades K-12 on one campus (the old Gary plan); to maximize community inputs into the learning enterprise; to utilize an ombudsman for grievance purposes; to remain open fifteen hours

[13] John Holt in Harold H. Hart, ed., *Summerhill: For and Against, op. cit.*, p. 97
[14] Rafferty, *Summerhill: For and Against, Ibid.*, p. 24.
[15] Bruno Bettelheim, *Summerhill: For and Against, Ibid.*, pp. 99–118.

per day; to give each student an individual room that is his for study or whatever; to secure new types of professionals with freshly defined responsibilities; and to employ every student enrolled as a member of the school work force.[16]

Efforts will be made to combine cognitive development with work skills. Since the student age range is about five through eighteen, the work assignments for which youngsters will be paid will be skillfully differentiated. The school is expected to coexist with conventional public schools and if successful be imitated on a larger scale.

For me the most exciting feature of the proposal is its work-ethic. Molding an entire school around internal jobs is a difficult, if not nonachievable objective. Nevertheless it is a bold notion and deserves a trial. The student-at-work feature is described as follows:

> Every student will have an opportunity to hold a job alongside his academic program. Some portion of each day, the student will work. The jobs will be varied in type, skills required, hours worked, and wages received; within broad limits, all jobs will be open to all students, with placement a function of proficiency, maturity, past performance, and job availability. In brief, there will be a work culture as nearly optimal as possible and still reflecting the patterns that exist in the larger society. The work will be significant, the money will be real, the opportunities will be visible, and the prerequisites will be realistically related to academic progress.
>
> Since this feature is unusual and might be misunderstood, three points of clarification need to be made. First, students will *not* be paid for "going to school"—i.e., for the business of progressing academically. They will be paid for work at school; the prime prerequisite for getting one of the jobs will be that they are going to school. In practice, this distinction will not be confused; the two are separate, though importantly related, activities.
>
> Second, this will not be "make-work" for which the students get paid. It will be, in fact, the business of operating the school. School is a micro-community; it mirrors most of the functions of society at large—transportation, food, building and maintenance, supply, clerical work, administration, training, equipment repair, purchasing, not to mention child care and teaching. These are jobs that must be done if the school is to operate; they are normally assigned to hired (classified) employees, in this case the employees will be students.
>
> Third, the emphasis is on opportunity for employment, not on vocational training. If, for example, an academically talented student wants to work in equipment repair, he can; it is the fact of his employment that is of primary importance. If

[16] *An Experimental School For The Urban Poor: Preliminary Design Formulation,* Systems Development Corporation, Santa Monica, California (January 1970), p. 41.

at the same time, he will be learning a skill that will benefit him in later life, all the better; but he need not be making a career decision when he applies for "work at school."[17]

The SDC school is a drawing board effort as yet. It has promise—nice conceptualization, expensive, new personnel, and an attractive philosophy. But it remains untested. And if tested, and it works, it will be but a pebble on the beach of needed educational reform.

Pennsylvania Advancement School. Established in 1967, the Pennsylvania Advancement School is now in its third year. It is located in Philadelphia, functioning with Title I and Title III support, plus school district and foundation funds. It is a nonprofit corporation guided by a distinguished board of directors.

The school is not a school—at least not in the traditional sense. It has students, teachers, psychologists, and a curriculum. But it does not exist primarily for the benefit of its enrollees. It exists as a model for change, a center for experimentation, a location for professional education of teachers, counselors, administrators, and para professionals. The school enrolls seventh and eighth grade boys from Philadelphia public and parochial schools who are underachieving. The school is housed in an old factory building which has been extensively renovated to provide visual stimulation and flexible space utilization.

New approaches are devised to effect useful community inputs, to use purposefully the scarce resources of universities, to rotate interested professionals in public and parochial schools through appointments to the staff, and to follow up students who spend fourteen week terms enrolled in the nonschool.

The school is a stimulus enterprise. Terribly useful in its own right for the fortunate few students that it affects directly, it is much more significant as an idea producer, tester, and sharer; more important as an unconventional burr under conventional saddles; valuable as threat and salvation simultaneously.

The summary report of its first two years produces passion and pathos.[18] Exciting ideas, committed personnel, confronting problems the magnitude of which remains unplumbed. It is similar to a hundred other efforts (many spawned by Title III), each joyful and anguish ridden simultaneously.

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 7–8.

[18] *The Pennsylvania Advancement School,* Report on the First Two Years, issued by The Pennsylvania Advancement School, Fifth and Luzerne Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19140 (July 1969).

Family Development Center. Two years ago in Columbus a number of us were casting about frantically for ideas to assist the Columbus Public Schools in overcoming some of their ghetto education problems. We were confronted with the universal urban data: dropouts, low achievement (especially in reading), deteriorating confidence in schools, and the clustering of aggravated deficiencies in certain families, to list a few.

We were impressed with the need to invent a new concept of institution —one that would permit simultaneous educational experience for the total age spectrum. Our admittedly crude formulation bears the name "Family Development Center." The attractiveness of the idea was enhanced by the availability of a superb facility in which to house the institution.

The objective is to create a powerful educational environment where adults and children can learn together; where public welfare, health, and educational resources can be concentrated efficiently; where employment skills, household skills, and artistic temperaments can be developed simultaneously; and where instruction can be supplied by families in which each member has teaching responsibilities.

The learners in the Center would be families. Selected families of all races would be invited to move into housing facilities selected for that purpose. (In Columbus a soon to be abandoned military base would be the site.) The families chosen should be representative of the broader society but among them would be unemployed families having parents with low educational levels and children who have learning problems. Faculty families would live there too.

The faculty of the Center would be made up of professionals from a number of fields. The entire environment would be a learning laboratory. The members of the faculty families would be teachers and learners simultaneously. The curriculum would be extraordinarily rich, quite informally organized, and designed to meet cognitive, affective, and motor skill needs. The faculty would have at its fingertips the city, its libraries, its museums and art centers, its theaters, its universities, its employment potentials. Instruction would be individualized with all types of teaching approaches being used.

For some purposes—art, music,, physical education, and recreation—adults and children might learn together. For other purposes, classes and seminars would be formed. Classes would not be restricted even then to conventional age ranges. The classrooms could be anywhere—on the site or in the downtown area, or in suburbs—wherever learning purposes could best be served.

Learning families where the adults were unemployed would be among those chosen. Extensive efforts would be addressed to bringing the adults

to the point of employability. During the early period of the family's enrollment at the Center, family support would be on the basis of welfare payments. As soon as employable skills could be developed for adults part-time employment would be sought. From this point forward the adults would work and learn simultaneously. Each family's curricula would be individually planned and fitted into the program of studies created for the Center.

Training for males in the trades could be achieved through the repair and remodeling of housing on the site for families. Skilled craftsmen and their families could be incorporated into the faculty for this learning purpose. Children of all ages could be involved too in assisting with painting, yard care, athletic field care, and the maintenance of other facilities.

Faculty families could be chosen on the basis of diversity of talents as well as willingness to participate in such an exciting venture. Faculty families should have teaching potential in the basic learning skills, the arts, music, homemaking, recreation, physical education, health education, social skills. Formal teaching certification requirements in many cases would need to be abandoned for at least some family members.

Learner families would leave the Center after adults and children were brought to social, educational, and employability levels satisfactory for effective and responsible citizenship.

The staff of the Center would include social workers, medical and psychiatric specialists, and psychologists and their families. The Center should also have a well-trained research staff. Social workers could assist with many of the welfare and employment problems; they could also help with family selection and relocation. The physical and medical health specialists would make their contributions in many important ways.

The minimal length of learner family tenure would be one year. Some families may need to stay longer than that period of time. Families could enter and leave at various points in the year. The staff of the Center would help in locating housing, appropriate educational facilities, and employment for families when they leave. Emphasis would be placed on locating black families in areas where open housing agreements exist.

To summarize, this institution would act simultaneously on several problems:

(1) It would be directed at removing educational deficiencies of children and adults simultaneously.
(2) It would focus public health, public welfare, and public education resources on common problems.
(3) It would be racially, socially, and economically integrated.

(4) It would, if successful, break the educational and poverty cycle and return adults immediately to independent earner and taxpaying status. Children would have improved chances for economic independence as adults.

(5) The cost would be modest when compared with continued welfare, public health, and compensatory education costs over at least two generations, if not many more.

(6) The cohesiveness of families would be sustained and strengthened during a period of intensive development for all family members.[19]

The Commune As An Educational Enterprise. Communes are being created across the world. The "family" of Charles Manson is currently the most celebrated and hopefully the least imitated. But it and apparently dozens more are cropping up in the rural and desert regions of the Southwest. Like experimental schools, most of them are doomed to short life. They are for many temporary way stations in and out of the hippy and/or counter culture.

These are not new phenomena. Therefore some are likely to become permanent. And like Gypsy colonies, they will produce a fascinating culture where all aspects of life will go forward including education. Communes, like the Amish and Mennonite religious groups, will raise new problems for educational authorities as they debate the pros and cons of forced school attendance. It is likely that superb education will go forward in some of them, especially where the adults are themselves well-educated. In the now blurred future, it is possible for some communes to create a promising blend of cognitive, affective, and skill development combining the best in formal teaching, apprenticeship, and free exploration of a complex environment.

* * * * * * * *

The experimental efforts described here are noble. As indicated earlier they are examples selected from literally hundreds of high expectation, blithe spirit sponsored attempts to revitalize sagging institutions. After a decade of emphasis on innovation we have only inched up on some traditional problems, chiefly in the cognitive domain and mostly for middle class children at that. Meanwhile a crescendo of other issues have surfaced dwarfing those modest achievements.

Somehow we must locate large scale reforms that reside somewhere between abolition of schools and where we are at the moment. The responsibility of principals in the short run is to participate in the debate and con-

[19] Much of this description is taken from *A Report to the Columbus Board of Education,* The Ohio State University Advistory Commission on Problems Facing the Columbus Public Schools, Columbus, Ohio (June 1968), pp. 98–104.

ceptualization of such matters. The responsibility for principals (and for professors for that matter) in the long range is very much in doubt. In this section several policy domains are explored. Should the reforms discussed independently be achieved collectively then there will have been a revolution.

Potential Arenas for Educational Policy Reform

Compulsory Education

In a brief article in the *Phi Delta Kappan* last November I suggested that compulsory education be abandoned, especially in ghetto communities.[20] It was interesting that among many letters and comments about the *Kappan* article only one individual (a secondary school principal about to retire) questioned wistfully whether we should "really" abandon such a cherished principle, even though it isn't working. From another perspective a conservative New Hampshire newspaper applauded the proposal with front page editorial space.

Kids are violating attendance with abandon in many places and the existence of such laws simply forces an unnecessary repressive strain on the institution.[21] Suspension or expulsion is a hollow threat for thousands of students. They could care less. Forced attendance has been the cornerstone on which a series of control measures have been constructed historically. Many resources have been invested in their enforcement actually reducing our capacity for more constructive changes.

Education, which emphasized cognitive growth, once was a cherished objective in America. It seems much less attractive in these times, at least to some. The tension among proponents of cognitive, affective and skill objectives will not in my judgment be easily resolved. To expect one educational program or one institution to achieve each of these emphases may be unrealistic in the Age of Aquarius. To provide educational opportunities which maximize diversity, it may make sense to expand educative choices for students allowing them to choose a program which emphasizes skill or affect or cognition. Such a notion might be linked to a national voucher

[20] Luvern L. Cunningham, "Hey, Man, You Our Principal?" *Phi Delta Kappan,* Vol. LI, No. 3 (November 1969), p. 128.

[21] California newspapers in April reported large numbers of students staying away from schools where teacher strikes were in effect (San Francisco and Los Angeles) and administrators were trying to keep the system running. The *San Francisco Examiner* (April 20) carried an account of elementary, junior and senior high school students who were truant in order to take part in or observe protests in Berkeley during mid-April.

system (described later) allowing students to select from a number of educational options those that seem most compatible with their life styles and aspirations.

Removing the compulsory requirement is a fantastic step. We fought two centuries to achieve it. We believe genuinely in the right for each child to an education. We are imbued with the sense that the state must protect against the intransigent parent or child who holds out against being educated. We find it incredible that the environment external to the school may be more educative than that internal to the school. Nevertheless those seem to be the realities and the compulsory attendance policy is bound to be carefully scrutinized as a consequence.

The removal of this expectation (linked with the adoption of a voucher system, community control, and the discontinuance of credentialing) may breathe new vitality into the society and transform institutions. Students, given the option to choose their own educational form, will have to make hard choices pretty much on their own.[22] Schools, if there are such, will have to be qualitatively distinguished to attract clientele. Professional accountability will be a genuine, grass roots reality. The system, if it could be so labeled, would be self-adjusting. That is, there would be motivation on the part of the client and the institution to achieve the most harmonious accommodation of expectations and satisfactions.

The Voucher System

Milton Friedman advanced the concept of market place education in the early 1960's.

> Governments could require a minimum level of schooling financed by giving parents vouchers redeemable for a specified maximum sum per child per year if spent on "approved" educational services. Parents would then be free to spend this sum and any additional sum they themselves provided on purchasing educational services from an "approved" institution of their own choice. The educational services could be rendered by private enterprises operated for profit, or by non-profit institutions. The role of the government would be limited to insuring that the schools met certain minimum standards, such as the inclusion of a minimum common content in their programs, much as it now inspects restaurants to insure that they maintain minimum sanitary standards.[23]

[22] There may be need for educational advisers, much in the pattern of legal services for the poor, to assist ghetto children and their parents in the wise use of options.

[23] Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962), p. 89.

Erickson, [24] Jencks,[25] and Sizer[26] have stepped up the tempo of its review within the establishment. The Office of Economic Opportunity is financing a limited feasibility study of voucher systems at Harvard under the directorship of Christopher Jencks. Parents, in four communities, will be provided vouchers equivalent in value to what would be expended for the education of their children in public schools. They can then make a free choice of educational institution and present the vouchers in payment for educational services. The public or private school will be able to convert the vouchers into dollars for operating expenses.

The early hostility to the concept seems slowly to be ebbing away. Like most ideas subjected to intensive examination, strengths and weaknesses are being exposed. The voucher system scores high on expanding options, stimulating diversity, and denationalizing the educational system. It produces problems in exercising quality control over the educational services available and in protecting against a new, potentially even more severe, set of discriminations against poor people. How will poorly educated parents know enough to spend their vouchers well?

As Erickson has pointed out a voucher system that provides the same resources (voucher values) to the poor as to the rich would be inherently discriminatory.[27] Erickson argues for larger allocations to poor families. Friedman's original advocacy did not allow for this distinction, although he recognized that some needy families may require more support than others.[28] He refers to essentially public school-private school options too, which seems unnecessarily restrictive given today's need for diversity. Vouchers could be exchanged for a vast range of educational services such as tutorials, museum and library services, nursery schools, literacy classes, private lessons, apprenticeships, dialogues, concerts, lectures, cable television, sensitivity sessions, encounters, and counseling services.

[24] See Donald A. Erickson, "Private Schools and Educational Reform," *Compact*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (February 1970), pp. 4–5. For additional appraisal of the voucher concept read Robert M. Krughoff, "Private Schools for The Public," *Education and Urban Society*, Vol. II, No. 1, (November 1969), pp. 54–79.

[25] The project that Christopher Jencks will head at Harvard is described in the *Saturday Review* (January 24, 1970), p. 65.

[26] Theodore R. Sizer, "The Case For A Free Market," *Saturday Review* (January 11, 1969), pp. 34–42, 93. Also Theodore R. Sizer and Phillip Whitten, "A Proposal for a Poor Children's Bill of Rights," *Psychology Today*, Vol. 2 (August 1968), pp. 59–63.

[27] Erickson, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

[28] Friedman, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

Community Control

The national stir about extended citizen participation and community control may be only a way station along the route to a sharply reformed governance structure.[29] Should compulsory education be abandoned and the voucher system adopted, then the public school system as we have known it would no longer be an essentially monopolistic enterprise. It would be a competitor right along with other public and private agencies delivering educational services. The function of the board of education would have to be expanded to include the general supervision of all institutions and individuals which would qualify as places where vouchers could be expended.[30] Community control boards would become institutional and individual licensing bureaus rather than policy planners for a single set of public institutions. Responsibility for the determination of educational standards and educational service quality levels would reside with the board. They would adjudicate grievances and specify methods for assuring wise voucher expenditure decisions on the part of parents unable to make those choices adequately.

The role and function of state educational government would be affected too. If today's local districts or new community control districts within large cities were delegated responsibility for licensure and quality maintenance, many of the current state level services and functions could be abandoned. State boards would serve as a super appeal board in the redress of local grievances. State departments could collect and disburse all public monies for education, collect data on performance levels of alternative forms of schooling, and continue to operate custodial institutions.

The persons serving on community education boards would find themselves subjected to new sets of pressures. At the same time, however, they should be able to guide the community to achieving a rich new set of educational potentials. The accountability monkey would be directly on those who provide educational services—public schools, private schools, tutors, private teachers, other agencies qualifying for voucher acceptances.

The public investment in facilities, maintenance, and supporting services may need to be examined in terms of equity vis-a-vis the entrepreneu-

[29] For a review of the problems and issues in community control see Luvern L. Cunningham, *Thoughts on Governing Schools* (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, to be released October, 1970).

[30] Donald A. Erickson, "The Public-Private Consortium: An Open-Market Model for Educational Reform," (Paper delivered to the 1969 UCEA Career Development Seminar, Alternative Models for Organizing Education in Metropolitan Areas, State University of New York at Buffalo, November 1969).

rial dispenser of educational wares. In time public schools, in the traditional sense, may give way. Those continued would be special schools for educating the physically handicapped and mentally retarded children. Other public buildings could be sold to profit and/or nonprofit corporations. In some cases current administrators and faculties may choose to incorporate, and through voucher support, operate the school and be responsible for maintenance, improvements, insurance, and bond retirement. Over a period of years, a decade or so, the majority of a community's youngsters could be attending schools that enjoy considerable autonomy at the school level and reside within a community controlled governing structure that possesses amazing freedom and control simultaneously.

Credentialing and Tenure

The pressures are severe these days to assess once again the credibility of licensure. Similar distrust in tenure persists at the college and university level as well as within the lower schools. The long fight to achieve tenure legislation in many states seems anachronistic in the face of mounting concerns about its dysfunctional features now.

Should the first three changes I've described (compulsory education, voucher, community control) come about, surely the licensure and tenure practices we have now would crumble. Positioning accountability so forcefully on local communities would require reappraisal of who should teach, counsel, or administer. The escalating distrust of authority, the devaluing of expertness, the substitution of affective goals for cognitive achievement —each imposes new demands on professional performance. It seems unwarranted to expect that all currently credentialed persons can transform themselves affectively or cognitively to meet new performance criteria. Therefore the security of tenure and protection of licensing must be reappraised.[31]

If the diversification of education is achieved through the voucher system then it stands to reason that large numbers of new teachers will be activated and legitimized by community control boards. On first inspection it may appear that the welfare of large numbers of professionals will be threatened. Given the time lag between now and the implementation of such large scale changes, today's professionals would either move out of education into other positions, update themselves to pass muster in the

[31] For a fascinating review of educational reforms including comments on licensure, read Paul Goodman, "No Processing Whatever," Beatrice and Ronald Gross, eds., *Radical School Reform* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1969, pp. 98–106.

new schools, set themselves up as tutors, or convert to emergent roles that are now on the drawing boards.

Public retirement systems will need to be expanded too to serve a number of new clients. Attention to policies of obsolescence will become a high order priority for those who govern such systems. The human problems associated with sharp policy reform will necessarily impose new burdens on our retirement structures. Substantial reformulations of early retirement or short term retirement options will be required.

Community Experience

Paul Goodman makes an eloquent case for de-institutionalizing education, turning the learner into the community, and treating each youngster as a person capable of making sensible educational choices. He accepts the need for some form of schooling as unavoidable, even attractive under conditions of freedom. "The school should be located near home so the children can escape from it to home, and from home to it."[32] Furthermore, the school should be administered entirely by its own children, teachers, and parents.[33] Goodman is Dewey-like, sympathetic to A. S. Neill, but still independently creative. His capacity to visualize the educational potential of living itself is rare indeed. His sense of exploiting the educative resources of the environment supersedes that of most advocates of the community school or community education. He is Rousseauian but with a more advanced vision of how the educative process can go forward balancing formal inputs from institutions with more naturalistic inputs from the environment.

For another purpose recently I was speculating about public services that students could render in an effort to halt decay in the physical environment. (The ecology pitch.) Students enrolled in traditional schools could pick up roadside trash, paint public buildings, repair streets, wash and repair public vehicles, haul away abandoned automobiles, investigate water pollution, trim hedges in parks, plant flowers, arrange art exhibits, edit agency reports, staff public day care centers, work in emergency rooms at county hospitals, and counsel the elderly in public nursing homes. One could spin off a thousand tasks, each achievable, and which collectively would lead to upgrading the physical and maybe even the social environment. And they would be educative.[34]

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 101.

[33] *Ibid.*

[34] A much more elaborate conception of noninstitutional educative potential is contained in Marshall McLuhan and George Leonard, "Learning in the Global Village," *Radical School Reform, Ibid.*, pp. 106–115.

Such advantages could be achieved through conventional schooling if we were to build in a break in the continuity of educational experience. A semester or year long period for modestly organized and loosely supervised community experience makes a lot of sense. It need not come at the same time for every student but at some time for all. The advantages are fairly apparent: (1) confrontation with the real world; (2) early assumption of citizen responsibility; (3) apprenticeships in public service occupations; (4) refinement of practical skills; (5) accumulation of new knowledge, and (6) performance appraisal in noncognitive arenas.

A policy of this order would not be expensive and could in fact be coupled with a shortening of the twelve year lower school educational requirement to ten or eleven years or be seen as a noncredit substitute for one or more years of formal work. In time it may even become a college entrance requirement.

* * * * * * * *

This discussion of several policy options has ignored a number of equally provocative possibilities. Discontinuing secondary education is one that has been advanced. Reallocating existing resources with heavy investment in the pre-school years with declining investment in later years is another. Introducing a formal publicly supported education period (probably one year) for everyone thirty years of age or older is still another.

The anxiety of professionals is elevated by the need for reform but even more so by the explosive, frustration saturated environment within which reformers must proceed. Is it possible to change anything? Especially an institution with so many types and layers of authority?

What do the needs for reform, the domains for change, and the anguishes of reformers mean for principals? In the opening section I indicated that I was pessimistic about the prospects for piecemeal, incremental changes. School systems may be chewed up by forces over which they have no control long before this approach can be effective. At the least, today's principals can hold the line and anticipate the apocalypse. At best they can participate in the formulation of large scale reforms. Principals, in the final analysis, know more about educating than any other group in the society.

John Barth was quoted in the *New York Times* recently to say that if he were face to face with his student assassin he would be bored. Like Barth, many of us are bored—by protest, by violence, even by nonviolence.

We're sick of hackneyed phrases—empty of meaning, drained of emotion. We're sick of frauds, charlatans, pseudoes, liberals, conservatives, whites, blacks and reds. Advocates for change have become Pavlovian; they

have lost their finesse. Adversaries and establishment types are drowning in the slime of their own rhetoric. Causes are empty; defenses are hollow. Respect, love, quality have vanished.

But these are wasted yearnings. The issues are before us. There is no escape with dignity. The problems extend beyond the personal or professional capacities of principals or professors. Solutions, if they can be found however, will be more socially satisfying if professionals are prominent partners in the achievement of reforms. It is pathetic to observe newcomers to the educational fraternity reinventing the wheel—especially when we are not confident that we need a wheel anymore. The vast reservoir of experience and education possessed by the nation's building level leaders should not be cast side promiscuously. Rather it should be one among many prominent resources invested in shaping the institutions of the future.

CHAPTER VI

ALTERNATIVES TO THE PRINCIPALSHIP*

LUVERN L. CUNNINGHAM

Introduction

Tonight we are going to be engaged in a different kind of event. Our purposes are somewhat mixed and for that reason we may not achieve the same level of satisfaction for each of them. We are here essentially to learn. Because our intent is to extend our knowledge (in relatively uncharted ways) we need to tolerate a little more ambiguity than we would normally expect.

Specifically our purposes for this session are as follows:

(1) to test a different mechanism for generating insights;
(2) to critique the vehicle itself;
(3) to produce alternatives to the principalship.

In regard to these purposes we are experimenting with a method for generating ideas. We are trying to reproduce (obviously in a limited, admittedly minimal way) some of the realities of the real world. We have constructed a somewhat atypical problem solving setting which will allow us to (1) anticipate more clearly what we can expect to occur in the real world in the near future, (2) appraise the extent to which this mechanism (and others like it) can be used to mold the future, and (3) invent some alternative building level administrative/governance structures for the future ourselves. We wish seriously to obtain an advance view of what such a problem solving setting might produce.

We are approaching administrative/governance as if it were a new problem, although obviously it is not a new problem. Others have dwelled on this matter for a century. There have been experiments with other ways (rotating principalships, chairmanships, committees) of managing educational affairs at the grass roots level. As a profession we have a rich history of evolving the principal's role. For decades the principalship has served our educational enterprises well. In recent years however new agencies and strains of leadership have surfaced at the building level. Leaders everywhere are the recipients of altered times, new conditions, new problems. It is reasonable to expect an institution to respond with new ideas and a

* Group participation in role playing what a faculty might do without a principal.

quality of boldness equal to emerging expectations.

Our intentions tonight are serious in this regard. We are searching with some desperation for ideas: ideas about how to produce ideas as well as new notions themselves. This group should be able to advance attractive proposals of both kinds.

When we close tonight's session we should have within our grasp:

(1) a set of alternatives to the principalship, obviously only roughly drafted and nebulous at best;
(2) a critique of the evening's process for producing ideas, more specifically an examination of this problem solving vehicle; and
(3) some specific insights about how tonight's problem solving group performed.

This is a large order, but we have large order people at this conference.

The Test Simulation

Background

The time is September, 1970. Over a period of eighteen months a set of forces were generated in our community (Circle Park) which led to a rather unusual request of the board of education. The request was to discontinue the principalship at Circle Park High School. The board of education accepted (April 1970) the recommendation of the students and faculty of Circle Park High School. The vote was 5 to 2. The superintendent of schools refused to make a recommendation either supporting or opposing the proposal brought to the board.

Circle Park, like many areas within urban settings, has experienced community, professional staff, and student unrest simultaneously. The principal, John Agnew, is leaving his post effective June 30, 1971. Thus the sentiments in favor of reconsidering the principalship as the governing form for Circle Park High School are in response to several forces. The fact that Principal Agnew (for three decades a respected leader) is to retire within a few months, the restive nature of today's world as well as disquiet in local communities, the growing discomfort with schools everywhere—these have coalesced sufficiently to bring Circle Park to this state of affairs.

Circle Park High School has a faculty of 110 professionals and is served by twenty-seven noncertified people. There are 2300 students. In 1969–70 there were approximately 700 freshmen, 600 sophomores, 550 juniors, and 450 seniors. The percentage of black and white students has stabilized in the last two years. A decade ago the school was predominantly white. At the present time there are 54 percent white students and 46 percent black. Both the professional and nonprofessional staffs are integrated. The non-

professional group is nearly 50 percent black and 50 percent white. The professional staff is approximately 20 percent black and 80 percent white. The building is located in Medium City, America. There are five other high schools sprinkled across the geography of the district.

Assisting Mr. Agnew are three assistant principals. Mrs. Eleanor Reuben is in charge of the educational program. Mr. Ralph Collins (a black) is responsible for attendance and student discipline. Mr. Frank Langley presides over the extracurricular affairs and gives general direction to the counseling staff.

There has been considerable tension among students from time to time. Boycotts, hostility related to student government and cheerleader elections, dress codes, underground newspapers, and drugs have been prominent problems in the last two years. The concerns of parents have clustered about drug abuse, general cleavages between students, parents and faculty; student conduct and declining interest in college entrance. The problem of race saturates the scene. At times it surfaces with more tension than at others, but it is always there.

The Reform Committee

A unique problem solving vehicle has been designed to work on the high school governance problem. It is called simply "The Reform Committee." There are fourteen members. Tonight we will witness and participate in its initial meeting. The committee members are positioned around the center table. We have asked each role player to use his own name. It is written on the name card along with his role designation.

1. Deputy Superintendent of Schools—Temporary Chairman
2. Four Circle Park High School teachers
   (a) English—white, female
   (b) Social studies—black, female
   (c) Mathematics—white, male
   (d) Physical education—white, male
3. Four students
   (a) Freshman—black girl
   (b) Sophomore—white boy
   (c) Junior—black boy
   (d) Senior—white girl
4. One noncertified staff member (engineer, Italian male)
5. Two parents
   (a) White female, liberal
   (b) Black male, young, aggressive

6. Assistant principal, black
7. Counselor, male, about twenty-six, athletic star

The teachers, assistant principal, and counselor were elected by the faculty. The noncertified staff member was chosen by the noncertified personnel in the building. The four student representatives were elected, each from one of the four classes in the high school. The two parents were appointed by the superintendent as was the temporary chairman.

Observation Panels

You will note that at each of three tables (near the demonstration table) there are persons serving as observers. Those at Table A have been requested to critique the mechanism as a tool for simulating the future—a means for producing a set of conditions in a laboratory setting that will allow persons to behave much as they would behave if they were doing the same thing in the real world. Those at Table B are to view the events of the evening through social science disciplines, i.e., what concepts help explain what has occurred? At Table C the critique panel will pass judgment on the specific product of the committee in regard to alternative forms of administration/governance for Circle Park High School.

We are going to begin the first meeting of this committee. The temporary chairman has suggested four agenda items for the evening:

(1) get acquainted with the purposes and objectives of the Reform Committee;
(2) to select a permanent chairman;
(3) list the problems Circle Park High School faces in governing itself;
(4) advance alternatives to the principalship.

Some Additional Remarks

The decision of the board of education to implement a new educational governance structure for Circle Park High School is firm. The majority of school board members were so impressed with the desirability of this reappraisal of Circle Park governance that it voted to abandon the position of principal effective July 1, 1971. The Reform Committee therefore has only a few months to clarify its ideas, select an alternative, and make a recommendation to the board of education. The board of education has given the committee $10,000 to use in its exploration. These funds are unrestricted and can be applied to any need which seems critical to the fulfillment of the committee's charge.

CHAPTER VII

STUDENTS AND THE SHAPING OF THE PRINCIPALSHIP

MICHAEL P. THOMAS, JR.*

Among the social forces which in combination are extracting from school systems new concepts of the roles and responsibilities of the principal, the emergence of well defined opinions about the rights of student bodies might be the most powerful. This conclusion is inescapable in the increasing number of situations in which secondary school children have taken direct and forceful action either to remove principals or radically to redefine the authority of principals and other administrators in relation to the academic and social rights of students. The student strike is becoming the classical format of this action.

There are, however, other and more subtle ways in which the day-to-day actions of students and principals are modifying, in process, the limits of authority and the character of acceptable transactions between the two. Individuals and groups seem constantly to be testing the legitimacy of authority with the aim of reducing the sphere of tolerance within which student behavior may be controlled.

To try to get some preliminary feeling for the strength and nature of student response to the role of the principal, we chose to go directly to students. Three pupils were selected to discuss their perceptions of the principalship with the seminar participants. The bases for their selection give clues to the kinds of opinions for which we were trying to probe, and those we wished to exclude.

First of all, the three were deliberately chosen for their articulateness. While powerful social action may emerge from inarticulate or incompletely rationalized motives, a more precise and self-conscious description of motives is necessary for analyzing social action. The three students, then, were not chosen as representative of the typical high school pupil. They had thought at some length about the meaning and value of school for their lives. One might almost have characterized them as the philosophers of a new mood, except that they had all been active in testing the viability of the traditional roles and relationships in their school organizations.

* Mr. Thomas is Associate Professor of Educational Administration, The University of Texas at Austin.

Although one was Mexican-American, no one was asked to participate because he represented the disaffected or disallowed among minority peoples. The social action of this latter group seems to be motivated by conditions in a society for which the school system is more a tool than a shaping influence. The choice of economically and socially majority group representatives was not to minimize the poignance and power of minority group action in redefining the role of institutionalized education in making an honestly pluralistic nation, but rather to strengthen the sense of the importance of student concerns about educational leadership by conversing with those whom we would normally expect to have a stake in preserving a system that values and rewards them.

The leaders for this session of the seminar were Dr. Paul Rothaus and Dr. Ira Iscoe.* Their task was to draw out from the students their attitudes toward life in a public educational system and especially their concept of the part the school principal plays in shaping that system. Two strategies served these ends. The session began with a rather straight-forward dialogue between the moderators, the students, and the seminar participants, and ended with the students' role playing a principal making decisions about problems devised by the seminar participants. The leadership skills of Drs. Rothaus and Iscoe were critical to the success of this part of the seminar. The inferences from the conversations they guided, however, are the author's, and are constituted of my efforts to locate a set of rubrics which might tie together the disjunctive comments of a two-hour conversation with a small sample of reflective students.

School and Life

While not directly the focus of the session, the relationship between the content of *schooling* and the students' perceptions of their needs for education turned out to be a theme of some importance. They seemed to expect a connection between the administrative function and the goals of education that eludes many administrators and not a few professors of school administration. In fact, although these students found it difficult even to think about the administration of schools apart from the instructional strategies of the system, they weren't always certain that they could specify what principals did that had an effect on instruction. Their descriptions of what they saw principals doing was clearly shaping their concept of the principalship itself. It is illustrative that when the students were told that the audience for their comments was composed of people who were

* Rothaus is with the Southwest Center for Psychiatric Services, and Iscoe is Professor of Psychology at The University of Texas at Austin.

in the business of preparing school principals, their response was in terms that sounded like "Gee, you mean they are prepared?"

There seems, then, to be little connection between what students see as important in their school lives, i.e., the content and quality of instruction, and what they see the school principal doing. This inability to find a connection between the making of decisions about educational programs and the activities of leadership in the school was producing the classical slippage between an organization and its clients: to whom do you complain if you're not getting the service you desire? Students' need for access to administrative leadership stems from some discontent with the quality and content of instruction. But when they are finally heard, they find the principal more concerned with the control of conduct than with the conduct of instruction, and not at all interested in a discussion of the propriety of instructional goals.

Controlling and Facilitating

When finally the discussion moved from a description of the frustrations of trying to be heard in the mysterious process of instructional decision making to the processes of administration, it was still difficult to keep the students' minds hovering about the role of the school principal. They seemed to be saying that administration is where you find it, and wherever it is it is telling someone what he can't do. In their minds, principals, teachers, superintendents, and boards of education are preoccupied with restricting behavior, limiting choices, narrowing ranges of alternatives, and reducing education to that which is easily controlled and organized. "It's like schools were being run so that teachers and principals will have jobs, not so that kids will be educated," went one of the stronger comments. There is little question that these students felt that the control ambience of the schools was hostile to any set of proper educational purposes, and even hostile to sound educational practice. As an example of what he meant, the youngest of our three students told this story. "When I was eleven I scared them with my underground newspaper. It was better written and more important and exciting than their official paper. It worried them because they couldn't censor it. You know, really, they should have been proud of me. Instead they suspended me. It took my dad's lawyer to get me back in school." These are plaints so common as to be trite in the organized world of public education today, but this group of students also voiced concern about what they felt was a more serious kind of overcontrol. Why, they asked, must everyone study the same things at the same times? Why do all classes have to be fifty minutes long and all courses one

semester long? Why is sophomore history just like sixth grade history? Educators too have asked these questions, but the students' answer was, "I guess it's because it makes a school easier to run." And then came the counter plaint, "But are schools for teachers and principals, or are they for teaching kids?"

Where is the power?

A surprising thread of analysis was woven through the rather grim description of a school administration ultimately concerned with the control of student behavior and barely aware of the many educational questions that students were asking. This thread first emerged in direct response to a question about the principal's role as a restrictor rather than a facilitator of educational choices, and it took the form of rendering the principal blameless. Blameless because powerless. "The principal really can't help it. He gets his orders from the board of education and he doesn't have any choices himself." There was a surprising tendency for these students to see the principal as what one author has called an organizational fiction. Students apparently are finding that there are levels of power to which, if they are sufficiently aggressive, they can get easy access and, perhaps more importantly, that the higher levels of power are more tightly constrained by legal definitions of civil rights than are the principals. Thus, our eleven-year-old editor could comment that his family attorney was able to argue the case of his suspension before the board of education on the basis of the guarantees of the First Amendment to the Constitution—an argument that eluded the principal. When pushed to the wall, then, the principal can be made to throw a case to a higher authority, because the higher authority has designed the rules of which the principal is only the enforcer. This phenomenon seemed clear to the students, two of whom had capitalized on it to gain relief from what they considered to be injustices.

It is a peculiar picture of principaling that emerged from this discussion. The decisions a principal makes seem unrelated to any important instructional matters; his reason for being is to define the limits of acceptable behavior for both teachers and students. But when he is challenged, the principal finds he has no power. He has not made the rules and so cannot abridge them. If one knows the route, it is much easier and probably more successful to go to where the rules are made and work to get them changed at the highest possible level.

Alternatives to the Principalship—or to the Principal

Without prompting, the three students were able to suggest several

alternatives to the principal as a unitary form of governance. The alternatives took the form of federations and coalitions of various combinations of people, students, teachers, parents, and alumni. To test how these models might actually work in the production of a decision or the development of a solution to a problem, the students role-played a kind of troika or committee model of institutional headship.

Whether due simply to lack of skill, or to their rather naive assumption that no one ever presents non-negotiable problems to a school administrator, the students found themselves resorting to problem attack strategies that were disappointingly reminiscent of what we've seen before. Perhaps people tend to administer as they have been administered, just as they tend to teach as they have been taught. They were probably less biased in their search for causes of the problems that were presented to them, and less prone to take quick action than those of us who can say we've been through it all before.

When it was all done, one of them said, "Well, I guess we have a better understanding of the problems of being a principal now than we did before, and maybe we didn't say anything new, but you know there's got to be a better way to run a school." One thing is certain, the creative thought and energy of reflective youngsters can supply us with new premises and new standards for designing the governance of schools.

CHAPTER VIII

A REPORT ON A PRINCIPAL'S EXPERIENCE IN PROJECT *PLAN*

CECIL MANSFIELD*

As school got underway last September, I was anxious to get into the classrooms to survey all the faculty to determine the kind of teachers with whom I would be working.

Upon entering the PLAN classrooms, it was immediately evident that the teacher's function and activity in the room was considerably different from that to which I had been accustomed. I recall stepping into a 2nd grade PLAN room not long after school started, just as the teacher had finished with the opening routine. She said to her students, "If you're ready, let's go to work." They got up and began to locate themselves at different tables and work areas around the room. Some went to the math center where books and materials were located; others went to a science table and began to be involved. Some began to read, and still others were listening to tapes or viewing film strips. The teacher took two students to the chalkboard and began to work with them on a basic math concept. Soon they were working on their own and she was checking a child's reading workbook as she worked her way toward a boy who was watering some newly planted seeds. As I circulated around the room, I talked to the children. Almost without exception these students could show or tell me that what they were doing related to an objective for one of the four major areas: Math, Reading, Social Studies, and Science.

I was impressed at the ease with which the children operated the various audio and visual machines located around the room. A few years ago, we gave college credit to teachers for learning how to operate such machines and now I was witnessing 7- and 8-year-olds using the equipment without difficulty.

I was also impressed by the number of one-to-one teacher-student contacts that were occurring. Those contacts were related to that child's problem, at that time, in that particular subject area. The students were working independently, the teacher was working 60 minutes of the hour, and there was a relaxed atmosphere in the room. I was indeed impressed.

* Mr. Mansfield is Principal of Reed Elementary School, San Jose, California.

As I was able to visit all the PLAN rooms, I found the same general atmosphere prevailing.

It became imperative that I know how the teachers were able to monitor the progress of each child. If a teacher has a command of time, a sense of organization, and a thorough understanding of the system, the process of planning and monitoring is relatively simple.

I'd like to show you that sequence now:

Project a P.O.S.

Each student has a P.O.S. in each of the four subject areas. The P.O.S. is a set of objectives (called a module) which is to be accomplished over a given period of time. The P.O.S. lists T.L.U.'s which will accomplish those objectives. The P.O.S. can be modified by the teacher and the student as he progresses through the T.L.U.'s.

Project a T.L.U.

Here is an example of a T.L.U. [Example shown on screen]. Note the objective stated, the suggested materials needed, and the activity which will accomplish the objective. At various points in the T.L.U. the student is directed to see the teacher before going on, and when he completes the T.L.U. he confers with the teacher.

Project a Test Card

If the teacher feels the student is ready to be tested on what he has learned, the student takes the test, records his answers on the card, and turns the card in to the teacher. The teacher submits the card to the card reader, which is hooked up to the computer, and waits for the computer response which normally comes back the next day.

Project a Print-Out

This print-out, along with other functions, tells the teacher that the child has or has not achieved the objective and alerts her for further action.

I have spent time on this project of changed teacher-student behavior and the daily process of the program because there are implications for my role as a supervising principal and my responsibilitly to give assistance to and evaluate teachers.

Evaluating Teacher Performance

Many of the tasks performed by PLAN teachers are similar to those of non-PLAN teachers. The main difference is one of emphasis.

In a regular classroom, the teacher spends a great deal of time planning which material to present and how to organize it. In PLAN much of this is already designed with alternatives to choose from—that is to say, alternatives that will best suit individuals in her class.

In PLAN rooms, the teacher spends most of her time working with individual students as opposed to the total class or two or three sub-groups in the room.

Therefore, I began to see that three basic criteria can be used to evaluate teacher performance:

1. Does the teacher understand the system and has she been able to arrange the classroom into subject centers and make the materials available for all students?
2. Does the teacher display the skills of good tutoring and counseling techniques when working with individuals? Is she able to assess the different needs of each child to help design and modify his program for him?
3. Does she use the feedback material from the computer to cut down on clerical tasks and bookkeeping?

In-Service Training of Teachers

I spoke of the change in teaching emphasis. To acquire the skills of good tutoring and counseling and to organize in a different manner hasn't come about automatically for our teachers. We have been involved in teacher in-service training to accomplish these skills. PLAN has taken the major responsibility for these sessions because we are a developmental school. However, the responsibility is the principal's. A classic example of this kind of training was a six-hour tutoring course on videotape where our teachers were trained by tape, practiced their new skills, and recorded them on videotapes, and then evaluated themselves. This, by the way, was accomplished during the work day by means of a substitute relieving the teacher.

We *must* come away from the after-school hours for in-service. We also must not assume that teachers hurry to summer sessions, come back to school in the fall, and are thereafter innovative. I firmly believe that the most effective way to change teacher behavior is to conduct training sessions relative to a program that they are involved with at the time they are involved. There *are* ways of doing this—some cost money, some don't. The *only* way the classroom changes is for the teacher's attitude and behavior to change.

Teacher Selection for Plan

The present Reed School PLAN faculty was selected because these people expressed an interest in individualized education. They probably would be good teachers in any kind of assignment.

Next year there will be four new teachers on the PLAN staff at Reed School. One will be the teacher who has been writing the 4th grade program with A.I.R. Another will be a 4th grade teacher from Reed School who will also implement PLAN at that level for the first time. The other two are replacements. (One is going to Europe for a year and the other is going to school to get a counseling credential as a result of her in-service training in PLAN.)

Let me tell you what I'm looking for in these three people in my interviews with them:

1. The interest expressed.
2. The teacher's belief that she does not have to be the "giver of information."
3. The teacher's belief in establishing an individual standard for each student and measuring the student's degree of success by that standard.
4. The teacher's belief that she can let go of her role as a designer of curriculum and emphasize the teaching role.
5. The ability to organize.

The biggest step in establishing a successful PLAN classroom is taken when the principal makes the judgment on the teacher he hires.

Graded and Non-Graded Aspects of Plan

Our school district's philosophy for several years has been to commit ourselves to an un-graded program, which simply means the erasing of grade lines on curriculum materials, and flexible grouping to allow students to work at their level of ability. This is easier said than done. The philosophy is sound but in practice there are many hurdles to overcome. I'm afraid that, in some cases, we have given lip service to un-graded programs.

Changing teacher attitudes and parent attitudes and being restricted by the physical plant perhaps have been the biggest obstacles.

PLAN, I believe, is about to make a truly un-graded program possible. In the initial writing and implementation of the project this was not the case. By implementing grade 1, 5, and 9 the first year, the gap between grades allowed for no crossing of grade lines for students; however, students did progress at their different rates through the grade level. As grades 2

and 6 were added, the possibility of 1st grade students working into 2nd grade materials became possible. Also, 2nd grade students who had not completed what could be considered normal progress for 1st grade could pick up where they left off the previous year, using 1st grade T. L. U.'s.

With this un-graded potential, promotion and retention practices are obsolete. Students need not repeat or skip a grade on the basis of academic achievement or ability.

I think you can see that once the 1-to-6 program has been implemented next year this will permit the student to find himself at any place in the sequence of objectives regardless of grade level. Therein lies a problem.

We can safely assume that given a cross section of students at any age level there will be those who will be able to go beyond what would be considered normal for that age level. Likewise, there will be those who will be slower to achieve. The PLAN system makes it possible to accommodate those children if the materials can be made available. How do we do that? This is perhaps the biggest problem facing me for next year. Remember, Reed School is designed as a traditional self-contained classroom facility. It will not be possible to provide in each classroom the range of levels for any one age group. One possibility would be to solve the problem through grouping; that is, place all students at a certain level together in one room and also place the materials for that level there. This would create a homogeneous grouping situation based on level of achievement. It would also mix students of as many as three age levels together. At the present time, I'm inclined to believe that is not the direction we should go.

Another solution would be through a grouping-scheduling procedure which would mean that at a given time during the day students who were slow in math would go to one room where materials for their level were kept, and the average or fast students would go elsewhere. This rigidity would destroy the concept of PLAN and would be impractical for primary children.

The most desirable solution, but one which may be the most difficult to accomplish, is to provide a center where students may come to draw materials (regardless of level) and return to the classroom to work. Our 10-year-old obsolete school is a handicap. I hope that this solution can be realized in some way next year to give us the full advantage of PLAN and its un-graded potential. It will require some assessment of priorities on the part of the principal and the total staff of the school. I could never overemphasize the importance of design and flexibility of the school physical facilities and their direct relationship to the instructional program.

Grouping of Students

At this time of year, and on into the summer months, principals everywhere are involved in setting up classes and grouping students for instruction. For the first time in twelve years I will approach grouping from a completely new angle. Those students who are in PLAN classrooms will move on to another teacher next year and probably stay together as a class. There will be adjustments made upon teacher recommendation to separate students or to match students with a particular teacher if that is necessary. For the most part, a student in one PLAN classroom will be able to work in another PLAN classroom with ease. This is possible because the basic system is the same and the un-graded aspects of the system will allow the individual student to work at his level. This allows us to accomplish a more heterogeneous group, which I believe to be healthy.

Students who will start in PLAN for the first time in 1st and 5th grades next year have already been selected. Because we are still in the developmental stage and want to insure the participation of a cross section of our student population, these children were picked at random, as were the children presently in PLAN rooms. The students have been paired and control groups set up to compare progress.

Once all levels have been implemented, the grouping procedures become even more simplified. If a school were only partially involved, as Reed is, with two classes at each age level, the task would be to select the students from Kindergarten to begin 1st grade PLAN and then make adjustments and additions to classes during the year as needed.

In a school that is made up of all PLAN classrooms, I can see how achievement level and ability would not be major influences in the grouping process. With all students involved, other factors would be considered when placing students together. Those factors would vary from school to school.

Student Discipline Problems From Plan Classes

The school principal or vice-principal still bears the image of the disciplinarian in most schools. Teachers still threaten to send kids to the principal when they misbehave, and parents still react violently toward the child when they find out he has been disciplined by the principal. Hopefully, as behavior modification techniques are being used more widely by teachers, this will be reduced to a minimum.

I can tell you without a doubt that I see *far* fewer behavior problems from PLAN rooms than from non-PLAN rooms. When they *are* sent to my office, it is usually a playground problem rather than a classroom problem.

I *can't* tell you *for sure* that the individualized system we are using is the reason for this, because the PLAN teachers, for the most part, are the kind who would normally handle their own problems.

Basically, in a traditional school setting there are two kinds of students who give teachers their biggest headaches and eventually are called to the attention of the principal: (1) The slow student who has never been successful in school and has "turned us off." These make up the biggest percentage. (2) The student who has not been challenged because of a locked-in graded curriculum. He looks for other things to do and becomes disinterested.

From previous descriptions of PLAN, I think you can see that this is far less likely to happen. I believe that individualized instruction can eliminate a large number of our so-called behavior problems. I hope to substantiate this next year as I follow some students who have been in non-PLAN rooms for four years and watch their reactions in a PLAN room.

Student Reaction to Plan

Let's turn to the students in PLAN classrooms for a moment. The best way to emphasize their positive attitudes is to let you hear it from them. [Play tapes.]

Orientation

As I began to prepare for this presentation the word *orientation* kept appearing in my notes. I don't need to say that for a program of this nature, well organized teacher and student orientation sessions are necessary. There are others who will have contact with PLAN who need to have at least some general idea as to what is happening in PLAN classrooms. Obviously, parents must be informed. I think we have convinced most parents that five rows of six desks with all students reading from the same book may not be the most desirable educational method for children. Yet there are those whom we must continually convince that we are making efforts to improve. PLAN or almost any innovative system needs parent support.

Other faculty members need to be informed and supportive too. PLAN teachers have something in common if it is nothing more than the lingo they use. It would be easy for this to become a problem on a faculty if everybody didn't understand the project.

The custodian, school nurse, and particularly the school secretary often have some involvement with PLAN which requires some knowledge of the program.

So, this area of orientation becomes vital as I try to assess the role of the principal in changing times in education.

Reporting Pupil Progress to Parents

If we have done a good job of orienting parents to individualized instruction, the job of reporting pupil progress can become a relatively easy one. If a parent understands that an individual program of studies has been set up for each child and that the child is being evaluated on *his* program, it is easy to report to parents. It is not, however, if you are locked into an A-B-C card. We happen to be. Another job at Reed School next year will be to develop a reporting system relative only to PLAN objectives. Ideally, I see this as two or more conferences with parents where the teacher gives to the parent the specific objectives and notes that the child has an adequate understanding of this or that concept or that he has complete understanding of this or that objective.

From past experience, I know that this will mean a selling job on some of our parents. To divorce themselves from comparative grades and progress reports on standardized tests will not be easy for some, even though they are supportive of PLAN.

Visitors

One of the time-consuming things, but a pleasant duty, has been to entertain visitors to Project PLAN at Reed School. Any new program will attract attention and visitors, but one of this quality, potential, and backing has brought people from all over the world. Local educators come frequently. Out-of-state people come once in a while. On occasion, such people as the Head of the Australian Office of Education, representatives from the Ministry of Education in Israel, and educators from France and Germany have signed our visitors book.

I'm sure that one of my college professors emphasized the important public and professional relations role of the principal. I must have missed the lecture on international relations.

Changing Role of the Principal

If we ask ourselves to identify the changing role of the principal, we must first establish what the role has been. If that role has been

1. to be aware of new programs, methods of instruction, and grouping techniques,

2. to be able to establish some objectives for his school and evaluate progress toward those objectives,
3. to be effective by being well acquainted with the curriculum and to help teachers perform in a manner that the curriculum requires,
4. and to be able to orient the community to the school objectives and program, then the role of the principal is not changing a great deal; however, the words in the script may be different.

If a principal finds himself involved in an individualized program such as PLAN (or another system which he has not been instrumental in developing) it becomes imperative that *he learn that system's objectives, procedures, and operations.* In my opinion, if he is to view that system realistically he has to *spend time in the classrooms and listen to his teachers evaluate it.* There will no doubt be additional administrative tasks in new systems. He must *be able to anticipate and budget time for these additional or changed tasks. The in-service training of teachers becomes a vital function* of the administrator, because in PLAN we are asking teachers to modify their role and teaching emphasis. *To strengthen communication with the staff,* to hear problems, and to solve problems together may make the difference between success and failure of a teacher or the program itself. And one must not ignore *communication with parents,* who can become friends or foes of a program, depending upon the quality of orientation.

Many of the precepts I have mentioned can be found in textbooks or could be recited by any good building administrator. However, in this day and age, lip service to these precepts will either cause little change in our educational system or it will result in confusion and even failure of a well founded, innovative program.

CHAPTER IX

WHAT KIND OF PERSON (IF ANY) IS NEEDED?

KENNETH E. MCINTYRE*

I begin with a resounding disavowal of any gifts of prophecy that the title of this disquisition might suggest. My record as a prognosticator is well illustrated in a series of disasters in playing the stock market; in fact, my friends no longer consult a broker—they just watch me and do the opposite of what I do. One of my unforgettable predictions pertained to a secretary who worked for us a few years ago. I predicted that she would be with us for a long time, but she resigned two weeks later—8½ months pregnant.

Some of my ancestors were also well known for their predictions. My father, for example, was advised not to invest in a farm back in the 1920's, by friends who pointed out that there was no money in it, the future for farmers was bleak, and all of that. Well, dad was a pretty sharp old gentleman, and he wan't about to be immobilized by the prophets of doom. He put all the money he had into a farm in central Nebraska, and sure enough, the drouth and depression came along and he went broke.

POINT OF VIEW

All of this is presented as a partial justification for my approach to this task. I take the position that few crystal balls are very clear, and I am certainly under no illusions about mine. Consequently, I shall not attempt any dazzling displays of prescience. My thoughts on the type of person needed for the principalship in the next few years are based on conditions that already exist and on trends that are clearly discernible now. This cautious position is due not only to lack of confidence in my ability to forecast the future but also to my belief in a sort of organizational law of inertia, which states that organizations such as schools, which have remained virtually unchanged or at rest for decades, will probably remain at rest. From this pre-supposition I reason that the type of man who makes a good principal now will tend to make a good one in the next few years. The other part of my law of inertia states that trends in a certain direction tend to persist in that direction. To summarize this whole point, then, I contend that

* Mr. McIntyre is Professor of Educational Administration, The University of Texas at Austin.

schools haven't really changed much for a long time and are not likely to undergo *cataclysmic* changes in the near future; on the other hand, some change is inevitable, and certain societal trends that are now clearly perceivable are our most practical guides to future conditions affecting schools and provide us with some hints as to the type of person who might function best in the school principalship in the 1970's.

My Task As I View It

I feel obliged to make a few other comments relating to the title of this discourse. I am addressing myself to questions concerning the *person* needed—the raw material—*not* the preparation program needed. I am leaving that problem to those who follow me on the program this morning. I restrict myself to the universities' problem of locating, attracting, and selecting the type of people who can become effective school principals. Whether they will or not isn't my problem.

The "if any" in the title of my paper is an acknowledgment of the possibility, if not the likelihood, that schools might not have principals in the future. Another possibility is that *principals* might not have *schools*—at least not as we know schools today. However, as far as the *near* future is concerned (and this is all I am attempting to deal with), my law of inertia tells me that it would be surprising, indeed, if schools or principals in the foreseeable future were to find ways to get along without each other. We might call principals by another name, which is one of our professions's most prevalent modes of response to challenge, but I would wager a significant portion of my worldly goods (that portion which remains after the aforementioned stock market calamities) that *somebody* will be around schools for many years to come, doing principal-like things.

One more comment about my use of terms is in order before I proceed with the burden of my message. Henceforth, to spare you the tedium of my references to both the male and female possibilities every time I speak of a school principal, I shall use the masculine gender. So, when I refer to the man in the principalship, I am speaking of mankind generically, not sexually. As Wendell Willkie put it, "Mankind embraces womankind." I have seen no evidence to support the anti-woman bias that prevails in many school principal selection circles; in fact, women in elementary school principalships (the only administrative position they have been able to attain in significant numbers) seem to do at least as well as men, and

perhaps better.[1] This should raise a serious question about the implications of the fact that the proportion of women is supervising principalships of elementary schools in this nation decreased from 55 percent in 1928 to 22 percent in 1968.[2] We are also told that women enter elementary school principalships later in life and are on the average about ten years older than their male counterparts. And the average female elementary school principal is four years older than her predecessors were ten years ago (56 compared with 52)— which surprises me, because women of that age group have been looking younger to me.

Discrimination against women, which almost amounts to institutionalized misogyny, runs deep in our culture, and is not likely to go away very soon. Sexton devotes a remarkable portion of her recent book to the imbalance between femininity in the classroom and masculinity in the administrative offices.[3] Cless discusses the problem as it exists in the colleges, pointing out that more than 75 percent of all intellectually qualified youngsters who do not enter college are girls, and adds that women with B.A. degrees are less than half as likely as men to earn a graduate degree, even though, on the average, they have better undergraduate records.[4]

In the hope that I have endeared myself to the ladies who might read this, I shall move on. The rather elusive point on which I started all of this is that I am using the term *man* to mean man or woman, even though I still recognize the difference.

Changes in the Environment

First, I shall review some of the forces at work in our society and in our

[1] Not much research has been reported on sex as a variable in school principals' effectiveness, but a slight tendency for superiors to prefer women and for women to involve others more in in-basket decisions was reported in John K. Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffiths, and Norman Frederiksen, *Administrative Performance and Personality* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962), pp. 332–334. Women were found to be more "democratic" and teachers were more pleased with the human relations existing under democratic principals, according to Hulda Grobman and Vynce A. Hines, "What Makes a Good Principal?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals,* Vol. 40, No. 223, November, 1956, pp. 5–16.

[2] *The Elementary School Principalship in 1968* (Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, NEA, 1969), p. 11.

[3] Patricia Cayo Sexton, *The Feminized Male: Classrooms, White Collars, and the Decline of Manliness* (New York: Random House, 1969).

[4] Elizabeth L. Cless, "A Modest Proposal for the Educating of Women," *The American Scholar,* Vol. 38, No. 4, Autumn, 1969, pp. 620–621.

schools that are affecting the job of the school principal. These forces have been discussed at some length at this seminar, so I'll merely mention a few that might have the greatest impact on the principalship, and hence on the man needed for the job.

One of the most apparent changes in the school principal's world pertains to his student clientele. We are told that "more than 2,000 high schools experienced sit-ins, boycotts, and other forms of student protest during the last school year."[5] Secondary schools in the urban centers are especially vulnerable, as a principal in the Bronx pointed out: "Language becomes harsher, and profanity is now coeducational. A subtle kind of defiant posture masks the normal tendencies of adolescents to be cheerful and cooperative. Absenteeism and cutting have mushroomed. The new breed of parent glories in the individualism of the child . . . Narcotics invade the most respectable of our high schools, and marijuana is obviously in high fashion among the most sophisticated and intellectual of the young . . . the angry mocking voices of the young militants find expression in the underground high school press. . . . my faculty are fearful of actual physical violence. . . . Parents call almost daily, reporting attacks on their children, but they are afraid to identify themselves. Intimidation by force is a new element in our education."[6]

Although this picture is fortunately not representative of all schools, it is not far out of line as a description of many urban schools today. And even in the more civilized situations, few principals are saying that today's youngsters are as docile and easy to control as they used to be. Not that the docility was necessarily good, but the kids *are* different, and the situation *is* more hectic and ulcer producing these days in most schools.

A second area of major change in the principal's professional life is that of his relationships with teachers. Like the students, the teachers aren't the lickspittles that they used to be. They are organized, they are outspoken, they are self-assured, they are aggressive, and they are increasingly unwilling to submit to authority based on positional status in a hierarchy. Through their organizations they are getting contracts that remove from the principal many of his time-honored prerogatives, like requiring teachers to cover classes in the absence of other teachers or to attend after-school faculty meetings at the behest of the principal. Principals are also finding it

[5] *Hot Line,* American Association of School Administrators, Vol. 2, No. 11, November, 1969, p. 4.

[6] C. Edwin Linville, "New Directions in Secondary Education," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals,* Vol. 53, No. 337, May, 1969, pp. 203–205.

increasingly difficult to involve teachers in our research projects—a trend that I find especially grievous, because it affects me directly.

One of the most salient features of the emerging scene pertains to the principal as an instructional change agent. He is caught in a role conflict squeeze, with the central office urging him on toward more "instructional leadership" and the teachers making it perfectly clear that the old notions of direct supervision are no longer tolerable.

If any one thing can be predicted concerning the principalship of the future, it is that the old paternalism, the old assumptions that the principal knows more than the teachers know about nearly everything—including the teaching they are supposed to be doing, the old exhortations to principals to become "instructional leaders" without helping them to develop understandings and competencies to deal with that role sensibly—all of these anachronisms are ridiculously out of place now and are rapidly becoming conspicuously dysfunctional.

What does this say to us as we ponder the principal's role and the type of person needed to do the job? Some of my colleagues and I would insist that however we think of the principalship of the foreseeable future, it cannot harbor fugitives from the expectation that principals need to know a good bit about teaching and learning. One difficulty that our profession has been experiencing arises from our confusion concerning the principal as a facilitator of learning. We tend to polarize on this issue—either the principal must spend 90 percent of his time visiting classes, holding supervisory interviews with teachers, and planning and conducting in-service education programs, or he must remain entirely ignorant of what is going on in the classrooms and completely aloof from instructional improvement activities.

I find neither of these positions tenable. I am much more attracted to some of the recent thinking that views a competent school principal for the 1970's as a changer of the environment in which teaching takes place, to the extent that the environment needs changing in order to accomplish the goals of the school. This role concept seems to envision the principal as a provider of things, an arranger of experiences to alleviate interpersonal conflicts, an eliminator of the nuisances that "bug" teachers, a bringer of resources to bear on instructional problems, an arranger of people and spaces to maximize the values of physical proximity, and the like. But this changer-of-the-environment role cannot be adequately fulfilled by a principal who knows virtually nothing about teaching or how to observe or analyze teaching systematically, or at least how and when to seek the services of others who do know such things, and who has no clear notion of

what the school is supposed to do for people. It is a matter of emphasis—not a choice between two irreconcilable disparities. My position is that the emerging realities point toward the prncipal as an expert on how to change the environment for accomplishing the school's goals—No. 1 of which is learning. The principal doesn't have to spend most of his time sitting in the back of classes, but he can hardly be a facilitator of learning if he doesn't know a class from a hole in the ground. He cannot be tolerated if he is an ignoramus concerning teaching and learning, especially if he attempts to compensate for his ignorance by behaving as if he were omniscient in his dealings with teachers.

A third force that we have examined this week is associated with the new technology. The applications of computers alone—to business administrative services, to student personnel services, to instruction, to the storage and retrieval of library materials, to problem-solving challenges of all kinds —these and other applications of computers and the development of the technology related to computers will surely nudge the principalship toward new dimensions in the next few years, and the man in such a technologized job could hardly be unaffected.

Urbanization is another one of the great societal movements that are affecting the principalship, not only in the urban centers themselves but also in the outlying areas. The 45 cities in the United States with populations of more than 300,000 have about 22 percent of the country's population and about 20 percent of all students in high school. Earlier I spoke about some of the problems these schools are having with students (and vice versa). No doubt many of these problems are related to the infiux of masses of economically deprived and culturally alienated people into the cities, accompanied by the exodus of the middle-class to the suburbs. According to Havighurst, ". . . the trend toward socioeconomic polarization between the city and its suburbs is reducing the proportions of middle-class students in the cities and, therefore, reducing the numbers of comprehensive schools in relation to the numbers of inner-city schools. Unless this trend is turned back—and it can be turned back—the comprehensive school will lose out."[7]

This is but one of the possible ramifications of this problem. The racial and ethnic groups are beginning to insist on a greater voice in decisions affecting the schools in their areas. Cronin and Crocker say, "In cities of over 200,000, the system of selection seems to replenish itself with the finest

[7] Robert J. Havighurst, "The High School in the Big City," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals,* Vol. 52, No. 332, December, 1968, pp. 47–48.

urban Irish, Jewish and Italian principals. But blacks and Puerto Ricans want someone like themselves—and the right to choose him. . . . When the Ford Foundation bankrolls a demonstration school unit—with a community chosen principal—do principals themselves demonstrate, litigate, legislate or simply slip away by seeking a transfer?"[8] My question is this: What effect should these waves of population movement and this insistence on greater community control of schools have on the kind of people we seek out and admit to our preparation programs?

Lest I use up all of my time and your patience in the preliminaries and never get to the main bout, I shall merely list two of the other trends or quasi trends that could alter the situation and hence affect the man in the principalship. The size and organization of schools and school districts could make a difference; we have some evidence to show that principals' behavior varies in relation to the population of the school districts in which they serve. Then too, Havighurst expects "a drastic shift in high school curricula which will tend to place the arts and humanities in balance with the sciences and mathematics."[9] Whether Havighurst is right or wrong in his prediction, what kind of man does it take to influence curricular change in desirable directions in times of great societal change?

The Process of Recruitment and Selection

The *process* of recruiting and selecting the type of man needed for school principalships deserves considerable attention in all universities attempting to prepare people for the job. Since I have spoken to this subject at some length, if not depth, in a position paper published under UCEA auspices,[10] I shall trace only the broad outlines of my thinking on this aspect of our problem. As far as recruitment is concerned, I doubt that we know much more about how to locate and attract promising people than we did several years ago when surveys of our practices indicated that we knew very little about it. I hope that most of us are hustling around more now to seek out the best prospects, and depending less on self-selection. This year we at the University of Texas are working with the Dallas schools to learn whether students, teachers, and parents can help us to identify promising people who might be missed with our usual procedures, which have consisted

[8] Joseph M. Cronin and Julian D. Crocker, Jr., "Principals Under Pressure," *The Urban Review,* Vol. 3, No. 6, June, 1969, p. 36.

[9] Havighurst, *op. cit.,* p. 120.

[10] Kenneth E. McIntyre, *Selection of Educational Administrators* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas and the University Council for Educational Administration, 1966).

largely of asking superintendents, principals, and especially the graduates of our program for such nominations. I have a hunch that two things tend to happen when administrators are asked to nominate outstanding teachers for administrator training: some of the best prospects are deliberately skipped over, for fear of losing them, and those who are named are the GASers, the Organization Men, the seekers-after power or pay—but not the mavericks, the critics of present practice, or the disdainers of orthodoxy.

Once we have flushed out the people who in one way or another have been identified as most-likely-to-succeed types, our task is to screen out those for whom the odds against success are too high. This, I am convinced, can be done only in a multi-phase process in which each candidate's fitness is appraised with increasingly fine discrimination. Preliminary to intial admission, test scores, transcripts, biographical data, and discussions with associates of the applicant will provide most of the data needed for a decision concerning admission to Phase I of the preparation program. Phase I could well be a several-week, full-time summer program providing many opportunities for attitudes, leadership, and other abilities to emerge. Situational performance tests, sociometric measures, and other assessments can be built into this initial encounter, at the end of which almost all of the clearly unpromising candidates can be identified and counseled into other fields. Phase II could be a semester of full-time residence study, followed by a semester in a full-time internship. Most of our students at Texas have Master's degrees before they enter Phase I, so they are ready to go into principalships at the end of Phase II.

I mentioned our recruitment project in the Dallas schools a few minutes ago. We are following that recruitment with a local training program that is similar to the one recommended previously for universities. It is also a multi-phase operation, Phase I being in progress now for a fairly large group of teachers and aimed at increasing competency in teaching. It is highly laboratory-centered, and is providing data that should be very useful in selecting the most promising for Phase II, in which each candidate will be given some on-the-job experience heading a six-week summer school. Phase III will follow later in the summer, and will consist of an intensive three-week seminar in the school principalship for the best remaining prospects. Finally, Phase IV will be a year-long internship for a small number of people who will be in line for administrative positions the following year. This internship will place the candidate not only in key positions around the school system but also in various community agencies. We hope to learn from this experience some significant lessons in recruitment, selection, and training. I contend that universities and school districts must first decide what type of man is needed, and then they must do something

resembling the process I have just described to locate people with the potential to become the man needed as well as to provide the necessary training to develop the potential.

Now—at long last—what kind of man will it take to run schools in the 1970's? My thesis is that it will take much the same kind of man that we should have had running schools in the 1960's but too often didn't. But in the next decade the stakes will be higher, the pressures will be greater, and there will be a heightened sense of urgency surrounding the principal's job. I doubt that we can be as sloppy about our admissions practices in the future as we have been in the past, because incompetence will become increasingly conspicuous.

Qualities of the Man Needed

I shall present my views on the qualities needed in the principalships of the future under four categories: intellectual, interpersonal, moral, and one I'll call emotional-physical. Although I am not primarily concerned here with the problems of measuring and assessing these qualities, I shall make a comment or two with regard to that aspect of each of my categories. I shall not deal with the impact of situational influences on the principal's behavior or on organizational processes or productivity. My avoidance of these influences should not be interpreted as a denial of their existence or their importance. I am simply delimiting my problem to the characteristics of the *man* whom we select into our preparation programs, assuming that we know nothing about the situations in which he will eventually be placed.

Intellectual. My ruminations on the principalship in some of our more trouble-laden areas, together with my discussions with principals during the past year or two, almost lead me into a cul-de-sac that finds me concluding that anyone who would aspire to a principalship these days couldn't be bright enough to handle the job. I retreat from that thought immediately, however, when I consider the large number of relatively pleasant or at least manageable situations that exist and will probably continue to exist, particularly at the elementary school level.

Assuming that intelligence will not be self-defeating, then, I am convinced that at least a moderately powerful intellect is one of the most essential of characteristics of principals and will increase in importance in the future. Call it what we will, and measure it how we will, mental ability has stood up remarkably well as a concomitant of success in school administration, even though our success criteria have been shaky at best and

our tests of mental ability less than perfect.[11] Tests of general intelligence or academic aptitude have also been found to be useful, when used with other measures, in predicting graduate-level grade-point averages in Education.[12] And outside the field of Education, tests of cognitive ability are consistently reported to be of value as predictors of both academic performance and effectiveness on the job, although success criteria in these other fields are as slippery as they are in ours.[13] The correlations are low, to be sure, usually on the order of .30 to .40 between such tests and the various criteria, but they almost always contribute significantly to accuracy of prediction. Taking into account the fact that we are dealing with an extremely difficult task fraught with measurement and criterion problems, we can hardly ignore one of the few types of data that are consistently even a little bit helpful.

What I have said about intelligence so far could have been said (and usually was, by me and others) for the past several years. I would contend that in the future it will be an even more critical qualification of school principals, because of the new expectations and pressures bearing down upon the job. What kind of mental ability and breadth of knowledge will it take to comprehend the mission of the schools in the 1970's and to grasp the implications of individual and societal need with regard to school program, organization, personnel, and facilities? What kind of intellect will it take to communicate effectively with the specialists who will be staffing our schools? How dull can a principal be and still sense the possibilities present in the application of technology to his planning, facilitating, coordinating, and evaluating roles? I insist that there is simply no place left in school administration for the "good old boy" whose sole qualification

[11] See Robert B. Moore, "Selecting Administrators Through Testing," in *Administrator's Notebook,* University of Chicago, Vol. 10, No. 8, April, 1962; Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen, *op. cit.,* p. 241; and Kenneth E. McIntyre, *Recruiting and Selecting Leaders for Education* (Austin, Texas: Southwest School Administration Center, 1956), pp. 29–30.

[12] See Omer John Rupiper, "An Analysis of the Graduate Record Examinations for Doctoral Majors in Education," *Peabody Journal of Education,* Vol. 36, March, 1959, pp. 279–285; and Walter R. Borg, "GRE Aptitude Scores as Predictors of GPA for Graduate Students in Education," *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* Vol. 23, No. 2, 1963, pp. 379–382.

[13] See Abraham K. Korman, "The Prediction of Managerial Performance: A Review," *Personnel Psychology,* Vol. 21, No. 3, Autumn, 1968, pp. 295–319; Kendrith M. Rowland and William E. Scott, Jr., "Psychological Attributes of Effective Leadership in a Formal Organization," *Personnel Psychology,* Vol .21, No. 3, Autumn, 1968, pp. 365–377; and Kenneth E. McIntyre, *Selection and Recruitment in Fields Other Than Educational Administration,* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Department of Educational Administration, 1965).

is that he is available. The reason for my shrillness at this point is that our record in the past has been something less than glorious, with regard to the average mental ability of the people in our preparation programs.[14]

I am not unrealistic enough to suggest that we hold out for nothing less than the literati. What I am proposing is simply that we set a reasonable cut-off point on a test like the Graduate Record Examination Aptitude Test, and that we make exceptions to it only where other evidence is impressively contraindicative. I am quite willing to live with the minimum score of 1,000 which we use for admission to the first phase of our program. No cut-off point can do any more than eliminate the poorest risks, so the selection of the best prospects must rest on all of the other data that can be gathered in the multiphase program that I proposed earlier.

When I advocate a decision rule requiring the elimination of people who score below a certain point on any test, I recognize the necessity of making exceptions on occasion. I think we make these exceptions far too frequently; however, where the applicant is handicapped because of his cultural background, then test scores must be interpreted with great caution. The application of admission standards that work reasonably well with white, middle-class, Anglo-Americans to others such as foreign students, blacks, or Mexican-Americans is so hazardous that it deserves special comment here.

Culture bias in tests is a phenomenon that we have recognized for a long time, but efforts to purge our tests of bias have been almost uniformly disappointing. Most of the studies use grade-point average as the criterion, and most of the studies deal with undergraduates. Here at the University of Texas, our freshman admission tests do not under-predict for black students, which suggests that whatever bias there is in the tests is also present in the grading system. But at the graduate level, where the problem affects us most directly, there is a surprising dearth of research on the test-bias problem. All we know for sure is that members of these culturally-different groups do not generally do well on our tests, and most of us are baffled as to what to do about it. We want more members of the minority groups in our preparation programs, and these groups are demanding a higher proportion of the principalships in areas where they live, but we don't know how to interpret their test scores. If we are inflexible in applying our cut-offs, then we'll have very few of these people in our programs. If we ignore the test scores entirely, we must depend on other predictors that are at least as questionable as the test scores, and we will end up with some

[14] Kenneth E. McIntyre, *Selection and Recruitment in Fields Other Than Educational Administration, op. cit.*, pp. 28 and 32.

embarrassingly inept performers on our hands. We can set lower cut-offs for the culturally-different applicants, but on what rational basis? I lean toward this latter option, but I feel uneasy about our almost total lack of research directly relevant to the problem.

Tests are not the only means of gauging mental ability, of course. The important question concerning any candidate is whether he behaves intelligently in job-relevant situations; hence, the provision of many opportunities for each person to use his intelligence is crucial for screening as well as training purposes, especially in the early phases of the program.

Interpersonal. We have known for a long time that school administrators spend most of their time with people and seem to prosper to a great extent in proportion to their ability to work with people effectively. It should be no surprise, then, to find an *interpersonal* category here. Looking ahead to the 1970's, I see no diminution in the importance of interpersonal considerations; in fact, there is every reason to assume that they will be even more important in the future, because the pressures for accountability will tend to crowd human considerations into the background. Culbertson recently spoke to this point when he said:

> Within the more specific context of the business-education dynamic two different rationalities will continue to conflict and to compete with one another: economic rationality, on the one hand, and what might be called human rationality, on the other. In the former, decisions are sharply influenced by efficiency considerations. In human rationality, decisions are weighed more in terms of psychological or social consequences. It is clear that economic rationality is assuming greater importance within school systems as we talk about education as investment, learning as educational productivity, programming in terms of cost-benefit analysis, and as education is described as labor intensive and inefficient in its uses of technology. This conflict is not entirely new. However, as the 1970's unfold and as business becomes more involved with education and education is influenced more by private sector thought and technologies (e.g., operations research) the conflict between economic and human rationality will become more intense and visible.[15]

I mentioned a few minutes ago that some of the school principal's cherished traditional prerogatives are slipping away. He can no longer expect teachers to be as subservient and tractable as they have been in the past. He must be able to rally the support of teachers who are no longer enthralled with hierarchical authority. His style must be that of drawing out

[15] Jack Culbertson, "Educational Leadership During the 1970's," symposium paper presented to American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, March 4, 1970, p. 3.

the best in others in a collegial type of relationship, not deciding what is best and expecting compliance out of personal "loyalty" or servility. Having served as a department chairman the past year, I think I have a feeling for situations in which the head man's power has little to do with his position in the organization. I see school principalships heading in this direction, with respect to relationships with not only teachers but also parents and others in the school community. Time was when the principal's word was law; now he must satisfy his constituents or face a demonstration or a boycott.

The assessment of abilities in the interpersonal relations field is not easy. Biographical data can be assembled to reveal the applicant's past record as an influencer or leader of people, and this is perhaps the best predictive evidence that we can get. In addition, we can profitably use sociometric devices in the early phases of the preparation program, if we remember that there isn't a perfect relationship between leadership requirements in different groups. I wish I could report that in-basket responses and performances in other simulations were more helpful as predictors of on-the-job behavior, but so far I have not been encouraged by our findings.[16] I still have hope, though, particularly since we have not yet studied the predictive power of some of our promising simulations.

Moral. When I speak of morality among school principals, I am not suggesting that they are typically subject to unbridled indulgence in carnal passions. In fact, I can't conceive of a less licentious group, outside of a convalescent home for retired fundamentalist ministers. My concern is with the broad issues of rightness and wrongness, with sensitivity to human need and feeling, with compassion for the weak and helpless, with ability to love the unlovely, with passion for freedom with responsibility.

A moral school principal, as I am using the term *moral*, is one who takes seriously the school's accountability for helping individual human beings to realize their full potential. He is almost militant in his determination to overcome obstacles to a decent educational program, as stated by Goldhammer and Becker after their study of more than 300 principals representing every state in the Nation: "In schools that were extremely good we inevitably found an aggressive, professionally alert, dynamic principal determined to provide the kind of educational programs he deemed necessary, no matter what."[17] He is a believer in law and order, and he demonstrates

[16] Kenneth E. McIntyre, "Six Studies on the Prediction of Administrative Behavior," *Educational Administration Quarterly,* Vol. 4, No. 1, Winter, 1968, pp. 45–54.

[17] Keith Goldhammer and Gerald L. Becker, "What Makes a Good Elementary School Principal?", *American Education,* Vol. 6, No. 3, April, 1970, p. 11.

his belief by operating the school in a lawful and orderly manner—including observance of laws, court decisions, and ethical principles pertaining to race, religion, and freedom of expression. He is more concerned with the depth of students' understanding than the length of their hair. He is outraged by the erosion of citizens' constitutional rights, and he scrupulously protects the rights of the citizens in the classrooms. He is, in short, a thoroughly *human* being who is dedicated to the proposition that the schools can be significant instrumentalities in the fulfillment of the American dream—a democracy with liberty and justice for all.

I hope that I am not unbearably sentimentalizing this aspect of the principal's personal makeup, but I am convinced that we have neglected the human, the philosophical, the moral dimensions of administration in the past and we cannot afford to continue this neglect. The kinds of problems pressing in on the schools, and likely to increase in the coming years, cry out for empathy, concern, and compassion—not for the dehumanization that threatens to overwhelm us.

Jack Culbertson and his associates at UCEA headquarters, in their monumental report of the "generalizations" project, argue convincingly that charismatic leaders will be needed to provide the vision, courage, and confidence in the period of societal stress that will surely face us for many years.

> Charismatic leadership emerges in periods of societal stress. Many citizens in troubled times aspire for strong leadership to deal with uncomfortable, ambiguous, or threatening conditions before them and their institutions. Charismatic leaders, at least for brief periods, convey hope and reassurance in the face of such conditions. Current and projected societal states which are typified by ambiguity and by pressing, unmet societal needs should encourage the emergence of charismatic leadership.
>
> Charismatic leadership is oriented toward reform and innovation, another requirement of the times. It addresses itself to basic problems and offers strategies for overcoming, eradicating, or resolving these problems. . . .
>
> Charismatic leaders possess a clear sense of mission and a strong commitment to the advancement of a *cause*. Having great confidence in their aims, they can communicate effectively such emotions as anger or "righteous indignation."[18]

Although Culbertson and his colleagues were referring to superintendents, I would argue that much of what they say would apply to school principals as well.

[18] Jack Culbertson, Robin H. Farquhar, Alan K. Gaynor, and Mark R. Shibles, *Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies,* Final Report, Project No. 8–0230, to U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1969), p. 326.

There are no easy ways to measure qualities such as these—which seems to be true of everything I have talked about. The inventories that purport to measure attitudes, values, prejudices, and the like have not proved to be very useful as selection or screening tools, although such instruments might be of some value for other purposes. Personal history is always helpful, if it can be learned from people who know the candidate well—but not via letters of recommendation or rating scales. In my opinion the most productive source of information about candidates' basic orientations toward the deeper issues of life is the first phase or two of the preparation program, where case and in-basket discussions, structured laboratory exercises, and bull sessions can be quite revealing. I am referring to the deep-seated inadequacies of philosophy or character that are virtually impervious to training, of course, when I speak of screening out the unsuitable.

Emotional-Physical. This last category is included because of a feeling that there is something crucial about the body chemistry of anybody who is under considerable strain much of the time.

At one time physical size was a recognized criterion for selection as a teacher in the rural schools of the Midwest where I grew up, for the simple reason that school boards wanted somebody around who could whip the unruly pupils. The recent assaults on teachers by pupils—numbering in the thousands in our major cities—suggest that ability to defend oneself might become a teacher selection criterion for the 1970's. Since school principals are also victims of such attacks, sharing with teachers the hazards of the internecine violence that has shattered the serenity of many schools, one might anticipate a flurry of articles in *School Management* dealing with the selection of principals, advocating the use of such criteria as quickness on the draw, keenness of peripheral vision, or hardness of heart, head, or hand.

Ridiculous and frivolous as all of this might seem, I am inclined to think that the pressures if not the hazards of the job are becoming increasingly severe, as Luvern Cunningham's memorable article in last November's *Phi Delta Kappan* so vividly portrayed. I have no doubt that the man required for the principalship, especially in the "difficult" secondary schools of the inner cities, will have to be able to live constantly and constructively with tension, conflict, challenge, and frustration, if not with actual physical danger. What kind of man must this be, and how can we distinguish between those candidates who have and those who do not have the stomach for such a position? I know of no dependable means of measuring such characteristics for screening purposes, although some personality inventories purport to measure such traits as "emotional instability," "nervous manifestations," and "fear and anxiety." The study of behavior in simulated

stress situations might appear to be a profitable course to pursue, but we have never been able to simulate the agonies of the job itself. Many who could not stand the heat probably eliminate themselves from the kitchen, but we must be concerned about those who do not, as well as those who eliminate themselves but shouldn't. The temptation to employ the techniques of quackery is especially great when one deals with the intricacies of the human temperament. Some of us still cling to the notion that we can read the other fellow's mind and character in an interview, and although interviewing can be useful as a selection tool under certain conditions,[19] most studies indicate that interviewing as we almost always do it is about as helpful as palmistry when used as a personality assessment device. When I ponder the ghastly errors that we make in judging people by way of interviews, I am reminded of Captain Robert Fitz Roy of H.M.S. *Beagle*. When Charles Darwin applied for the post of naturalist for a charting survey by the *Beagle*, Captain Fitz Roy nearly rejected him because his nose suggested a lack of "energy and determination."[20] Thus the shape of Darwin's nose, as interpreted by an interviewer, almost cost the world the information that provided the basis for *Origin of Species*, one of the most influential books ever written.

Up to this point I have not mentioned a quality that is possibly the most important of all. I shall call it adaptability, or change-proneness. It doesn't neatly fit any of my categories, but it has ramifications in all of them. Although I took the position earlier that schools are likely to look and act like schools as we know them for the next few years, and I insisted that the kind of man needed in the principalship in the future will be much the same kind that schools *should* have had in the past, there is an increasingly urgent need for principals who can respond effectively to changing and uncertain conditions. Goldhammer and Becker again caught the essence of what I have in mind when they said, "Perhaps the most important thing that distinguished the beacon principals was their ability to adapt to ambiguous situations. They didn't need the rigidly defined situation that most administrators seem to require as a security crutch."[21] In the past, our schools generally survived the tenure of principals and other administrators whose devotion to organizational stability was so compelling and pervasive as to render them incapable of any but the most superficial changes. The schools will not survive this kind of resistance to change in the future.

[19] For example, see Donald L. Grant and Douglas W. Bray, "Contributions of the Interview to Assessment of Management Potential," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 53, No. 1, 1969, pp. 24–34.

[20] Alan Villiers, "In the Wake of Darwin's *Beagle*," *National Geographic*, Vol. 136, No. 4, October, 1969, p. 451.

[21] Goldhammer and Becker, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

The measurement of adaptability in individuals has eluded us almost completely up to the present time. One reason is that we have never defined the term with enough clarity and precision to research it. If we define adaptability to be one's ability to make suitable adjustments to requirements or conditions, as my dictionary does, then we face the problem of determining what is *suitable* and what the *requirements* or *conditions* are. In fact, concern for adaptability forces us into the uncomfortable position of having to solve a multiple criterion problem by predicting individuals' success in a series of unpredictable situations, even though we have not been able to define and measure "success" in known situations. Nevertheless, the man needed in the principalship in the future is the one who can deal effectively with needs as they arise, who can adjust to new and often highly unprecedented situations, who can create the right kinds of problems and then create solutions for them. The fact that we have primitive measures of problem-attack behavior, dogmatism, something called "creativity," and other likely aspects of adaptability should suggest the possibility of launching some longitudinal studies that could light a few candles to penetrate the darkness of our ignorance. However, our existing research is hardly the sort of thing that would sweep us up in a wave of over-confidence. As with most of the other qualities that I have mentioned, we can cite *actuarial* statistics to show certain better-than-chance relationships between change-proneness criteria and certain predictor variables, but actuarial statistics deal with populations, not individuals; unfortunately, our task is to select individuals, one at a time—not crowds. Most studies tell us, for example, that innovators are, on the average, younger than non-innovators in a rather wide range of occupations and professions, including teaching and school administration.[22] Carlson found amount and recency of education to be associated with adoption of innovations by a group of superintendendents.[23] Bohlen, and Rogers contend that innovators and early adopters

[22] See David G. Ryans, *Characteristics of Teachers* (Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, 1960); Joe M. Bohlen, "The Adoption and Diffusion of Ideas in Agriculture," *Our Changing Rural Society: Perspectives and Trends,* Edited by James H. Copp (Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1964), p. 277; Everett M. Rogers, *Diffusion of Innovations* (New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962), pp. 172–174; Everett M. Rogers, "What Are Innovators Like?", *Change Processes in the Public Schools* (Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965), p. 58; Richard O. Carlson, *Adoption of Educational Innovations* (Eugene, Oregon: The Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965), pp. 56–65; and Benjamin Raymond Wygal, "Personal Characteristics and Situational Perceptions of Junior College Instructors as Related to Innovativeness" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1966).

[23] Carlson, *op. cit.,* pp. 53–55, 59.

tend to be more cosmopolitan than local in their orientation[24], and several investigators report that early adopters are less dogmatic than later adopters.[25] However, rejoice as we might in any finding that is less chancy than drawing candidates' names out of a hat, we must soberly face up to the fact that we know very little about identifying the changers (if there are any) in a roomful of prospects, most of whom are non-changers.

Conclusion

If I have given the impression that the kind of people I have been talking about don't exist, or if they do exist they wouldn't flock into school principalships, or even if they did appear before us our selection devices wouldn't identify them—if this is the impression I have left you with, then I haven't entirely failed in the purpose I set out to achieve. Although the kind of people I have been describing do exist, I am certain that they are rare and the competition for their services is fierce. They aren't going to storm our doors, demanding to get in. We'll have to go out after them. And our selection tools are pretty dull—we can't depend very much on the usual devices, most of which have been thoroughly discredited. We have a tough challenge ahead of us. I hope we are up to it.

[24] See Bohlen, *op. cit.*, p. 278; and Rogers, *Change Processes in the Public Schools, loc. cit.*

[25] For example, see Rogers, *Diffusion of Innovations, op. cit.*, p. 176.

CHAPTER X

PANEL-SYMPOSIUM: UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE FUTURE AND THE PREPARATION OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AT THREE UCEA UNIVERSITIES

PRESENTERS: Ray Cross,* John Maas, Fred Staub

MODERATOR: Alan Gaynor

Introduction

Decisions, personal or organizational, are inevitably based upon value priorities, attitudes toward significant and relevant others, and beliefs about the way things are and are likely to be in significant and relevant places. In planning and developing programs for the preparation of school principals, departments of educational administration make certain assumptions about the nature of school organization and governance in at least the near future. The assumptions may be random or systematic, implicit or explicit, linear projections of the *status quo*, or radical discontinuities from existing patterns. Whatever their substance, the faculty's assumptions about the future, along with its values, attitudes, and beliefs, will manifest themselves in the shape and direction of its preparation program.

This seminar amply demonstrated, even within significant limitations of time and numbers of participants, the variety of variables which can be considered and the range of assumptions which can be made about each of them in projecting the future world of the principal. Even a selected list of variables identified and discussed by speakers and other participants at the conference underlines the complexity of the program planner's task. Following are nine of these variables which seemed of particular import:

1. *Degree of autonomy of attendance area units.* How autonomous should building units be? How can school districts strike the balance between sufficient building autonomy to facilitate adaptation to local needs and sufficient centralization to guarantee economies of scale and adequate

* Mr. Cross is Associate Professor of Educational Administration, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Mr. Maas is Professor of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Mr. Staub is Professor of Educational Administration, The Ohio State University, Columbus; Mr. Gaynor is Associate Director of UCEA, Columbus, Ohio.

standards of performance and professional growth?

2. *Administrative style.* What identifiable characteristics may underlie administrative style? Which of these are amenable to training? What implications do these characteristics have for recruitment and selection?

3. *The responsibility of educational organizations for nurturing the inner growth of students.* What kinds of principals will best facilitate self-actualization of students and teachers? Are new role definitions required, new criteria for selection, and new instructional approaches in the preparation programs?

4. *Radical alternatives to public compulsory education.* Is voluntary education a viable alternative? Mightn't public funds be used to support a competitive structure of public, private, corporate, and even non-school types of education?

5. *Student inputs into educational organizations.* What do students have to tell us about alternatives to existing educational forms? How can mechanisms be developed which provide ongoing input nodes for students in educational policy-making?

6. *Group decision-making models.* What kinds of human interaction decision-making models, consensus or otherwise, can effectively be employed to optimize decisions within a context of competing values and diverse demands?

7. *The principal as the man-in-the-middle.* How can principals move beyond survival toward leadership in a world of rapidly changing demands —from pupils, teachers, parents, and citizens at large? Is the cooperative discussion model (which assumes homogeneity of values, attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions) a valid approach to inter-group decision-making or other forms of partisan mutual adjustment more appropriate to existing conditions?

8. *Technology and education.* Is individualized instruction now a practical possibility in public education? What are the implications of new organizations for instruction for the role structures of schools—teachers, students, paraprofessionals, and principals? Are there dangers in the concept of a national curriculum? Are there dangers in the involvement of private corporations in the development of national curricula?

9. *The principal as a person.* What kinds of characteristics must principals possess? How can universities recruit and select students who possess the requisite *stable* characteristics? What programs are required to meet the training needs implicit in the questions which have been raised at this conference? How do selection procedures and training programs relate to important social issues such as the infusion of minority group members into positions of authority and leadership in the educational establishment?

Following more than three days of discussion of these issues and others, representatives from three universities were each asked to respond to three questions:

1. What assumptions is your institution making about school organization and governance in the 1970's?
2. What assumptions is your institution making about the role of the principal in the 1970's?
3. From these assumptions, what is your institution planning to do about the preparation of school principals?

Their responses reflect the thinking of somewhat diverse faculties about the world of the future and the preparation of school administrators to serve that world.

The University of Minnesota
Assumptions About Societal Changes

1. The press for full citizenship by minorities will be accelerated. The schools will become the major locus of action to achieve this goal.

2. The trend toward wider use of technology will continue and increase. This will undoubtedly require more technical instruction for an increased percentage of the population. This is a basic condition if technology is to aid in the educational process. However, the fundamental problems of education are not linked to a better understanding of technology, but rather the focus must be on human values. The threats to our civilization are not with us because we do not have sufficient technological knowledge. Instead they relate to our lack of values in respect to other human beings and to our lack of appreciation for the ecological balances necessary if we are to survive on this spaceship earth.

3. The mass migration of people from the farms and small towns to the cities will continue. As stated earlier, less than one of five will live outside metropolitan areas in 1980.

4. Continued mobility of people will sharpen the demand for a national culture. To promote ready adaptation to new environments and challenges, persons will need to possess a common set of values and symbols as well as techniques for learning new ideas rapidly.

5. Because of concerns for ecology and overpopulation, family size will decrease, resulting in a decline in school enrollments.

ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT SCHOOL ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE

1. The trend toward larger and fewer school districts will continue. However, this trend will be countered in part by decentralization of schools in

large cities. Also parts of the city systems will join with suburban districts to form new educational units as the courts compel states to eliminate gross inequalities in educational opportunity.

2. New structures for education will be created. These will include regional, multi-state planning agencies as well as special purpose districts and councils within states.

3. The role of private enterprise in formal pre-college level education will be expanded. This development will be most pronounced in job-oriented education but will also include some general education programs in elementary and secondary schools. Moreover, most of the noninstructional services will be provided by private enterprise.

4. The role of the state education agency will experience marked changes in the years ahead. Supervisory services will diminish in importance, and the need for administrative leadership capacity will increase as research and planning gain in stature and respectability.

5. Nationalizing influences on education will continue unabated. Government and nongovernment organizations will create stronger alliances and thereby generate increments of influence. These alliances will communicate directly with local school units (especially in large cities) and in many cases will operate programs which parallel or supplement the offerings in the public and private schools. Such intervention is most likely to take place in areas or with reference to problems which state and local governments are unable or unwilling to solve.

6. Increased demands for funds in support of education and other local services plus a complete transfer of operating decisions to the educational profession indicate a changing role for the local school board member. These persons will become exclusively concerned with providing legitimization for the school through the representation of, and balance among, political interests in the community.

7. The distinction between public and private education will receive less attention in the years ahead. This leveling of distinction between public and private schools will take place along with the closing of many private schools for financial reasons. Additional subventions of federal tax money will be directed toward private schools, however, within the general rubric of the "child benefit" theory.

8. Formal and informal educational programs will be much better coordinated than at present. The environmental influences such as the home, neighborhood, and subcultures will receive much more attention in planning and conducting the formal education programs.

9. The patterns of control the school has over the lives of students will be greatly modified to suit the needs of each learner. Considerable time will

be allocated to off-site learning experiences and total time spent in school by the student will be shortened.

10. Student participation in school government will be accepted as useful. Students will provide meaningful inputs and develop leadership capacity in the process.

11. The school will accept the responsibility for providing many additional services to children and family. These services will extend beyond the current age span of "school years" to include early childhood and adult education.

12. The "free school" movement will become more prominent, especially in metropolitan areas, and will be incorporated in some instances within the formal system.

13. Educational institutions will establish systems for outside auditing of educational outcomes.

14. Teachers will assume a greater role in decision making regarding the instructional program of the school.

15. Greater autonomy will be granted to the local school to increase its ability to be responsive to the community. More programs and structural changes will be initiated at the local attendance level.

Assumptions Concerning the Role of the School Principal of the Future

1. The role of the principal will become even more ambiguous as he attempts to articulate his relationships with the various professional strata and elements of the community. The role will require a high tolerance for ambiguity.

2. The major requisite of the principalship in most schools will be conceptual educational leadership rather than clinical supervision. (Conceptual education leadership implies leadership in goal setting, planning, evaluation, and piecing out structure within the system. Clinical supervision suggests auditing the teaching-learning process for the purpose of counseling individual teachers).

3. The principal will more frequently be required to mediate conflicts among various elements in the school setting (e.g., teachers, parents, and school boards). He will more often function as a synthesizer of information and points of view.

4. Because of increased autonomy of the local school unit, the principal will acquire more responsibilities formerly discharged by central office personnel (e.g., staff selection and allocation of resources).

5. The principal will enter into more team relationships with the superintendent and other administrators in the system in order to articulate the program of the local school with other components of the system.

Plans for Preparation of Principals at University of Minnesota

1. Beginning in 1970–71, a program for training Indians for administrative positions in the Federal system of Indian schools will begin. The majority of these students will ultimately become principals of Indian schools. Students for this training program will be recruited from the ranks of Indian teachers.

2. Beginning in the summer of 1970, a Leadership Development Seminar will be initiated. Persons attending these seminars have been identified by cooperating school districts as individuals having "potential for administration." The seminar will be an eight-week block of time experience having the following purposes:

   a. To develop skill in group processes by using the participants' goal setting and procedural planning as a laboratory.
   b. To assess the potential of each participant through objective tests, sociometric techniques, and observation. These data will be used in consulting with each cooperating district concerning the advisability of encouraging the participants to enter administration.
   c. To provide a first step in an administrator development program sponsored jointly by the University and the cooperating school districts.

3. Training for the principalship will emphasize conceptual educational leadership at the expense of clinical supervision.

4. Principal trainees as well as trainees for other positions in educational administration will receive training in quantitative techniques appropriate for administrative decision making rather than the traditional statistics of education psychology.

5. Interns for the principalship will spend part of their internships with other school administrators in order to acquire a "system wide" view of the school organization.

6. Content relevant to collective negotiations and grievance procedures in the school setting is being included in principalship courses. Primary vehicles for instruction in this area are simulation and case studies.

7. Clinical experiences for prospective principals increasingly stress contact with dissident elements in society, such as militant minority organizations and high school student groups.

8. A newly instituted course in recent research in elementary school administration is designed to equip trainees with knowledge of research rele-

vant to new internal organizational structures. Emphasis is placed on the implications of the results for making decisions on internal school organization.

The Ohio State University

Assumptions About Organization and Governance

1. Organization will increasingly be seen as a tool to maximize the achievement of explicit values and goals.
2. Accountability will be stressed, but diversity rather than uniformity will be recognized. The accountability of the learner will be a new frontier.
3. As federal funding increases, there will be a trend toward the development of a common body of goals, agreed upon as normative for preserving and adding to the national heritage. The current "right to read" is illustrative.
4. Schools will increasingly become accountable to the areas they serve. Community agents, ombudsmen, and sensitizing groups will play an active role in policy development, resource allocation, conflict resolution, and other forms of governance.
5. Self-actualization and the responsibilities of citizenship will increasingly be delineated and interrelated.
6. *De jure* and *de facto* decentralization of school systems will continue, with concomitant diverse constraints, resources, and priorities operative.

Assumptions About the Role of the School Principal

1. The principal will increasingly work from an explicit goal and value orientation. He will need to be a philosopher, comfortable in the area of discussing the values by which people live. He will be a student of marshalling needed resources in creative organizational relationships to facilitate the accomplishment of objectives that will be increasingly explicit. He will be seen as an enabler.
2. The principal will need to be a skilled interacter, a selector of appropriate inputs to facilitate the accomplishment of objectives which will change frequently. He will work as a team leader of clinicians, whose skills must be directed toward the accomplishment of agreed-upon goals.
3. The principal will be experimenter with decision-making patterns. Crucial to the success of this will be his skill as a communicator, particularly with those who have traditional concepts of decision-making and authority.
4. The principal will need to be a master listener, striving to hear what people are trying to make explicit. From a sensitive reality orientation, he

must then assist those with whom he relates to recognize that which they are striving to articulate, and to choose from among feasible alternatives the most promising routes to use toward the accomplishment of objectives.

5. The principal will need to have the capacity to keep alive idealism among people impatient for change, but who are often naive about the nature of change in an orderly, free society which tolerates and encourages diversity.

6. The principal will need an in-depth knowledge of the processes and tasks of administration and will need to work with them with sufficient ease, competence, and openness, so as not to make them esoteric. His skills will facilitate the accomplishment of objectives.

7. The principal will will come from a variety of backgrounds and will be a practitioner of pure administration.

8. The principal will be a radical, who goes to the heart of institutions, value positions, and traditions, to determine that which is basic to the central goal of improving man and society by the dynamic intervention of the school.

The University of Wisconsin
Assumptions About Societal Changes

The 1970's will be a period of increasing contrast in the organization and governance of schools. Several conditions which began to emerge rather strongly in the late 1960's may be expected to continue.

1. Federal, state, and local courts will continue to influence the governance of the schools through the complaints of students, parents, taxpayers, and other interested parties who seek redress of grievances. This influence may become more pronounced as the Justice Department becomes more involved in carrying out executive orders and supervising H.E.W. regulations.

2. The development of teacher powers in the 60's and the use of the collective bargaining mechanism as a means of resolving administrator-teacher differences has been generally unsuccessful. The 70's may see the continued development of teacher power but there will also be an intelligent search for a mechanism stressing dialogue and resolution rather than confrontation and division.

3. State education agencies will assume increasing roles of importance as funnels for state and federal aids and as enforcing agents of state regulations.

4. Schools will be put under increasing political pressure from state and local governmental units to reorganize to meet the needs of students *and*

to produce better results for the tax dollar. In fact, one may expect federal and state officials to begin to examine alternate forms of organization—including multi-service units for parts of the metropolitan centers where education and other services cannot function in relative isolation. Such an organization may well represent the ecology of public service.

A second form of organization almost certain to be suggested is the non-profit public corporation. Suggested many times as a means of streamlining the post office, it may well offer some of the same advantages to education.

5. We can expect continued consolidation into larger units in rural areas and reorganization within metropolitan areas to more humanly and economically sensible units.

As one examines these assumptions one can readily see the inherent conflict arising between special interest groups.

One can only surmise that resolution of community needs will have to be clearly and accurately established as a priority if some of the conflicts in governance are to be avoided.

The Role of the Principal

The basic assumption to be gleaned from all of the speculation about organization and governance is that the role of the principal—if indeed there will remain a principal—will be within the framework of a middle-management team.

We would assume that the man for all seasons is as anachronistic in education as the single manager idea is in well established corporations. Only one reason remains for a principal—leadership. Leadership is not an exclusive property of any one individual—in a management team leadership may be shared appropriately with others responsible for services within the team. The strengths of each individual can be properly utilized.

The principal in such a configuration may be responsible for assessment, evaluation, information, planning, and overall coordination.

If this sounds as though he will be removed from students, he will be, but probably not any more than he is now.

This also anticipates the creation of a service unit under the leadership of the principal which will encompass the many services demanded in urban centers.

The leadership of the management team anticipates teams of various sizes and for varying purposes.

In addition, one might reflect that in practice the role of the principal has become unique to each man who bears the title and the unit in which he functions. In essence, the principal has defined his role in his school and

insofar as he, his teachers, and the top administrators have been satisfied it has remained there.

The management team offers some opportunities for changing this situation.

What is your institution planning to do about preparation for the principalship?

By way of introduction to this section let me say, quite candidly, that the University of Wisconsin has an ideal called the Wisconsin idea. It means, in essence, that the individual professor is free within reason to search for truth as he sees fit and to advise his students accordingly.

Second, let me say that generally, the staff at Wisconsin is inclined to look at administration as administration—that is, in terms of overall principles of administration rather than positions in administration. Consequently, there will probably be no specific program for the preparation of principals in the immediate future.

Third, let me put my first two remarks in perspective by saying that there is currently a great deal of interest in the idea of middle management and the problems of the urban principal in particular.

In our E.P.D.A. program to prepare urban administrators, we found that a number of individuals needed a chance to develop or initiate in such basic areas as making presentations before groups, developing a basic idea into a written program, writing letters, organizing, handling immediate administrative problems, data processing, budgeting and planning, etc.

Consequenty, one may expect to find a high degree of simulation in the Wisconsin program in the future designed to develop and practice these skills as well as decision-making skills.

One may expect to find requirements, though changing, to include a larger number of courses at the Master's degree level, since that is where more individuals interested in the principalship begin their work in Educational Administration at Wisconsin.

Finally, the development of training and retraining needs will cause the department to initiate an organization and development of a special program centered around skills required in the field but not necessarily offered for credit as such. Some examples might be:

assessment and evaluation
personnel development and training
computer technology
the development of a middle management team